DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 395 977 TM 025 115

AUTHOR Myford, Carol; And Others
TITLE Formative Studies of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments--An Overview. The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers.
INSTITUTION Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J.
REPORT NO ETS-RR-94-20
PUB DATE Jun 93
NOTE 252p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; *Classroom Techniques; Cultural Differences; Data Collection; Evaluation Methods; *Evaluators; Field Tests; Formative Evaluation; Interrater Reliability; Knowledge Base for Teaching; *Teacher Evaluation; *Test Construction
IDENTIFIERS *Praxis Series; Subject Content Knowledge

ABSTRACT

The Educational Testing Service is developing a new generation of teacher assessments--the Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers. The assessment series consists of three components. An academic skills component will assess the candidate's basic academic and enabling skills. Subject assessments will test the candidate's grasp of subject matter. Classroom performance assessments (Praxiss III) will assess the candidate's application of knowledge in an actual classroom setting. This document describes a series of eight formative studies that were conducted during the development of Praxis III. Research efforts were targeted in: (1) field testing the various data-collection instruments; (2) examination of the processes and strategies involved in retrieving, coding, and evaluating teacher performance data; and (3) analysis of how the performance assessment addresses issues of diversity in teaching and learning. The studies were conducted in two cities in 1991. Trained assessors working in pairs evaluated a total of 18 teacher candidates and then evaluated the assessment system. The paper highlights the major findings of each of the formative studies, discusses their implications, and describes how they led to informed changes in the Praxis III assessments. Eight appendixes present assessment instruments used in the studies. (Contains six tables and eight references.) (SLD)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED 395 977

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
H. I. BRAUN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

# Formative Studies of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments – An Overview

**Carol Myford**
**Ana Maria Villegas**
**Anne Reynolds**
**Roberta Camp**
**Charlotte Danielson**
**Jacqueline Jones**
**Joan Knapp**
**Penny Lehman**
**Ellen Mandinach**
**Lori Morris**
**Alice Sims-Gunzenhauser**
**Barbara Sjostrom**

June 1993

**RR. 94-20**

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TM025115

Educational Testing Service

Copyright © 1993 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS and the ETS logo, and THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# FORMATIVE STUDIES OF PRAXIS III: CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS

## An Overview

Carol Myford
Ana Maria Villegas
Anne Reynolds
Roberta Camp
Charlotte Danielson
Jacqueline Jones
Joan Knapp
Penny Lehman
Ellen Mandinach
Lori Morris
Alice Sims-Gunzenhauser
Barbara Sjostrom

June 1993

Copyright © 1993 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.

EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## Abstract

Educational Testing Service is currently developing a new generation of teacher assessments--The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™. The assessment series consist of three separate, but related, components. Praxis I: Academic Skills Assessments will assess the candidate's command of basic academic or enabling skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. Praxis II: Subject Assessments will test the candidate's grasp of subject matter and his or her knowledge of the teaching and learning process. Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments will assess the candidate's application of this knowledge in an actual classroom setting.

This document describes a series of formative studies that were conducted in support of the development of Praxis III. The research efforts were targeted in three broad areas: (a) field-testing of the various data-collection instruments; (b) examination of the processes and strategies involved in retrieving, coding, and evaluating teacher performance data; and (c) analysis of how the performance assessment addresses issues of diversity in teaching and learning. The overarching goal of these studies was to identify strengths of the performance assessment system as well as aspects that needed further refinement.

The studies were conducted in Minneapolis, Minnesota and Dover, Delaware during November and December 1991. Trained assessors working in pairs carried out an assessment cycle in which they observed a candidate teaching a lesson, interviewed the candidate before and after the observation, and reviewed several documents the candidate had completed. A total of 18 candidates were evaluated. The assessors took notes during the interviews and observations, and then coded them. From their coded notes, assessors selected pieces of evidence to include on a Record-of-Evidence form, a document that summarizes the evidence the assessor obtained for 21 criteria of good teaching and provides a rationale for each rating. Assessors weighed the evidence they obtained for each criterion and used a scoring rule to assign a rating on the criterion.

When the assessors had finished rating candidates, they met as a group to evaluate the assessment system. The assessors completed questionnaires and work sheets and engaged in small- and large-group discussions to share their reactions to using the assessment system. These activities and the records of evidence provided the data for the formative studies.

This overview document highlights the major findings from each of the formative studies and discusses the implications of those findings for the Praxis III assessment system. The last section of the paper describes how the developers used the results of the formative evaluation to guide them in making a number of informed changes in Praxis III, that is, in revising the domain descriptions, criterion descriptions, and accompanying scoring rules. Changes were made in the data-collection instruments and in the assessor training program, and new procedural guidelines for carrying out Praxis III assessments were instituted.

## Table of Contents


Abstract ..... iii
Introduction ..... 1
I. Description of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments ..... 2
II. The Formative Studies ..... 5
Design of the Studies ..... 6
Formative Study A ..... 6
Formative Studies B1-B6 ..... 7
Formative Study C ..... 13
Methodology ..... 14
Setting and Participants ..... 14
Procedure ..... 20
Results ..... 22
Formative Study A ..... 22
Formative Study B1 ..... 29
Formative Study B2 ..... 34
Formative Study B3 ..... 37
Formative Study B4 ..... 41
Formative Study B5 ..... 43
Formative Study B6 ..... 47
Formative Study C ..... 51
III. Using the Findings to Improve Praxis III ..... 56
Formative Study A ..... 56
Formative Studies B1-B6 ..... 58
Formative Study C ..... 64
Summary ..... 65
References ..... 67

Appendix A
Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments Criteria and Domains
(Fall 1991 version) ..... A-1
Appendix B
Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments Criteria and Domains
(Fall 1992 version) ..... B-1
Appendix C
Description of the Assessor Training Program Used in the Pilot Tests ..... C-1

Appendix D
Background and Experiences of Assessors and Candidates at Each Site ..... D-1

Appendix E
Criterion Descriptions and Scoring Rules
(Fall 1991 Version) ..... E-1
Appendix F
Criterion Descriptions and Scoring Rules
(Fall 1992 Version) ..... F-1
Appendix G
Instruments/Forms Used in Praxis III
(Fall 1991 Version) ..... G-1
Appendix H
Instruments/Forms Used in Praxis III
(Fall 1992 Version) ..... H-1

## Introduction

Educational Testing Service is currently developing a new generation of teacher assessments--The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™. The assessment series consist of three separate, but related, components. Praxis I: Academic Skills Assessments will assess the candidate's command of basic academic or enabling skills in reading, writing, and mathematics. Praxis II: Subject Assessments will test the candidate's grasp of subject matter. Optional content-specific pedagogy modules are available to allow the candidate to demonstrate knowledge about teaching the subject. Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments will assess the candidate's application of this knowledge in an actual classroom setting. This document provides an overview of a set of formative studies that were conducted in support of the development of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments.

The report is organized into three major sections. Section I provides a context for the formative studies by presenting a description of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. The description gives attention to the various methods used to collect performance data for candidates, the instruments used to obtain the information, and the process used in collecting and analyzing the performance data as well as in arriving at a judgment about the candidate's teaching competence. Section II describes the formative studies, including their design, methodology, and results. Section III discusses how the findings from the formative studies were used to improve different aspects of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments (e.g., criteria descriptions and accompanying scoring rules, data-collection instruments, procedural guidelines, and the assessor training program).

## I. Description of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments

In response to calls from the education community for performance-based teacher assessments, Educational Testing Service has developed Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments, a comprehensive system designed to assess the readiness of beginning teachers for professional practice. Praxis III makes use of several methodologies to collect data on teacher performance, including review of written documents prepared by the candidate, interviews with the candidate, and classroom observations.

Data collection centers around a series of "instructional events" or "lessons." As used in Praxis III, an event is a discrete instructional segment--typically 45 to 50 minutes in duration (or what would normally be considered in schools a full class period). Individual assessors conduct an "assessment cycle," a series of assessment activities surrounding each instructional event. At least two different assessors collect performance data for each candidate at various points throughout the candidate's initial year of teaching.

To begin the assessment cycle the candidate completes two forms, a Class Profile and an Instruction Profile. The assessor uses the Class Profile to become familiar with the characteristics of students in the class as well as to gain information about classroom routines and procedures. In a sense, this form gives the assessor insight into the classroom context. The second form, the Instruction Profile, serves as a blueprint for the lesson or event to be observed. This instrument elicits information about the instructional goals, materials, activities, and evaluation strategies that the candidate will use in the target lesson.

Prior to observing the lesson, the assessor interviews the candidate. In preparation for this interview, the assessor reviews the information reported in the Class Profile and the Instruction Profile. During the preobservation interview, the assessor discusses the Instruction Profile with the candidate and probes for clarification where necessary. The assessor takes notes throughout the interview and records the information on the Preobservation Interview form. Following this interview, the assessor observes the

candidate carrying out the planned lesson. Throughout the observation, the assessor takes descriptive notes on the actions of both the candidate and students on the Classroom Observation Record. Full scripting is not required or encouraged. Instead, the assessor is trained to focus on the types of classroom behavior that will enable him or her to make valid and reliable judgments about the candidate's competence on a set of 19 evaluation criteria that are at the center of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Following the observation, the assessor meets with the candidate to discuss the lesson. In this interview, the assessor asks the candidate to evaluate the effectiveness of the lesson taught, to discuss aspects of the lesson that he or she would do the same and/or differently in the future, and to explain how the lesson will be followed up. The assessor records the candidate's comments on the Postobservation Interview form.

After reviewing and coding the interview and observation data, the assessor completes a Record-of-Evidence form. This form asks the assessor to summarize the evidence obtained for each evaluation criterion and to rate the candidate's performance on each criterion using corresponding scoring rules. Appendix F includes copies of the latest version of the six instruments/forms used in the assessment cycle (Class Profile, Instruction Profile, Preobservation Interview, Class Observation Record, Postobservation Interview, and Record of Evidence). The 19 evaluation criteria, with descriptions and scoring rules, are found in Appendix F.

An integral component of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments is a five-day training program for assessors. The training includes a variety of activities designed to give prospective assessors a clear understanding of the Praxis III criteria, instruments, data collection, and reporting processes. Attention is given to the conception of teaching and learning underlying Praxis III (Dwyer &Villegas, 1992) . The evaluation criteria are explained, and the scoring rules used to rate a candidate's competence on each criterion are presented and discussed. A key feature of Praxis III is the infusion of a multicultural perspective throughout the system. A portion of the training is devoted to

preparing the assessors to detect and evaluate aspects of culturally responsive teaching in the instructional events they will assess.

The assessor training program is also designed to prepare prospective assessors to use the various Praxis III methodologies properly. Participants are given instructions on strategies for reviewing documents, interviewing candidates and taking notes during the interviews, conducting classroom observations, and taking descriptive notes on the actions of both candidate and students.

Preparing assessors to make fair, valid, and reliable judgments about a candidate's teaching competence is still another aspect of the training program. Assessors are trained to code their notes from interviews and the classroom observation, to select evidence from their notes that relate to each criterion, and to rate the candidate's performance on each criterion using the scoring rules provided.

To qualify as an assessor, individuals must participate in this carefully designed training program and demonstrate their competence in using Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Only those individuals who pass the assessor certification test during the final day of training are certified by ETS to conduct Praxis III assessments.

## II. The Formative Studies

In order to provide guidance to the developers of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments, ETS researchers conducted a series of studies during the system's initial pilot-test stages. The overarching goal in conducting the studies was to identify the strengths of the classroom assessment system as well as aspects that needed further refinement. The developers used the results of the formative evaluation to guide them in making informed changes in the criteria descriptions, scoring rules, assessment instruments, procedural guidelines, and assessor training program. This section of the report describes the formative studies.

ETS researchers designed the formative studies with input from a planning committee that included representatives from test development, statistical analysis, and program administration. After extensive discussion, the committee agreed to target the research efforts in three broad areas: (a) field-test of data-collection instruments; (b) examination of the processes and strategies involved in retrieving, coding, and evaluating evidence included on the Record-of-Evidence form; and (c) analysis of how effectively the system addressed issues of diversity in teaching and learning.

All of the formative studies involved pairs of trained assessors who completed an assessment cycle. Each member of the pair independently reviewed the Class Profile and Instruction Profile completed by their candidate. Both assessors participated in the preobservation interview with the candidate. Only one of the two assessors asked the questions and probed for additional information during the interview, but both took independent notes on the candidate's responses. The two assessors observed the candidate teaching the lesson and took independent notes during the actual observation. Both assessors participated in the postobservation interview, but only one of them asked the questions and probed for additional information. Again, each assessor took notes independently during the interview. (Appendix D presents brief descriptions of the education and experience of each assessor pair and of the candidate the pair assessed.)

Each assessor then completed a Record-of-Evidence form for the candidate. For each candidate, there were two separate sets of documentation, one set for each assessor.

After the assessors had finished the activities, including completion of the Record-of-Evidence form, they met to evaluate the assessment system. In a group setting, the assessors completed questionnaires and work sheets and engaged in small- and large-group discussions to share their reactions to using the assessment system. These activities and the Record-of-Evidence forms provided the data for the formative studies.

## Design of the Studies

Formative Study A

Because of the performance-based nature of Praxis III, data collection is accomplished with a set of instruments and forms. Assessors use these instruments to gather relevant information regarding a candidate's teaching in order to judge the candidate's competence with respect to each of the Praxis III criteria.

In this study, we field-tested the five instruments used to collect performance data in Praxis III: (a) Class Profile; (b) Instruction Profile; (c) Preobservation Interview; (d) Class Observation Record; and (e) Postobservation Interview.

A critical aspect of the development process was to study the characteristics of these instruments when assessors and candidates actually used them in the field. The primary purpose of this study was to learn about the effectiveness of these tools and the training given to assessors. A secondary purpose of the fieldwork was to determine the operational implications of the use of these instruments (e.g., to determine whether the procedures for distributing and collecting the various forms were clear and whether any changes were needed to help the process run more efficiently).

Our investigation focused on three broad areas--instrument content, instrument format, and data-collection procedures used. The questions guiding this investigation are listed below, by area:

1. Content

    a. Is the purpose of each instrument in the assessment process clear?

    b. Is the contribution of the instrument to the various aspects of the assessment process clear?

    c. Does each question in each of the instruments have a purpose in the assessment and/or validation process?

    d. Should any questions be deleted, added, or reworded?

2. Format

    a. Is the format of each instrument easy for both the candidate and the assessor to use?

    b. What changes, if any, are needed in format or presentation?

3. Data-collection procedures

    a. Were the assessors sufficiently prepared through the assessor training to use each of the instruments effectively and, ultimately, to carry out the data collection and assessment cycle?

    b. Did the candidate receive sufficient information about the assessment process for filling out the forms?

    b. Are the instructions for using the instruments clear to the candidate and to the assessor?

    c. Given the purpose of the instrument, are the data-collection procedures appropriate?

    d. What changes, if any, should be made in the procedures to render the system more effective and efficient?

Formative Studies B1-B6

Because the classroom performance assessments rely heavily on trained assessors' professional judgments, the developers requested that some of the formative studies look closely at how assessors used the measurement tools to make their judgments. The developers wanted to gain an understanding of how assessors take notes, code notes, select evidence to include on the Record-of-Evidence form, and analyze and weigh that evidence to arrive at a final rating for a criterion. In planning the formative studies, the developers sought to answer two broad questions: (a) How do assessors carry out these tasks, and (b)

what problems do they encounter in the process? From these broad questions, a set of more specific questions was formulated. The list of specific questions was quite extensive, so ETS researchers proposed a series of six studies (Formative Studies B1-B6) to investigate the questions. Listed below are the specific questions that provided the focus of Formative Studies B1-B6:

1. Taking notes and coding evidence in the notes

1a. How do assessors take notes during the observation and interviews? Do they encounter any problems when they carry out this task? If so, how do they handle those problems? Do assessors differ in the quality of notes they take?

1a1. Are the notes from the classroom observation complete enough so that the reader gets an overall sense of the flow of activities that took place in the classroom?

1a2. Do the observation notes contain examples of teacher talk, student talk, teacher actions, student actions, interactions, and time notations?

1a3. Do the notes from the observation and interviews contain enough detail so that the assessor can cull them for evidence to support the judgments made for the criteria?

1a4. Do the notes from the observation and interviews include only documentation of what occurred and what was said?

1b. How do assessors code information they have in their notes? Do they encounter any problems when they carry out this task? If so, how do they handle those problems?

1b1. Were there certain criteria assessors did not feel they understood? Did this create problems for them in coding information? Do any criteria overlap? Do any criteria need to be subdivided?

1b2. Were there important pieces of information assessors collected that could not be coded for any of the existing criteria?

1b3. Did assessors find certain pieces of evidence that could be coded as evidence for more than one criterion?

1b4. Did assessors find no evidence in their notes to code for certain criteria?

2. Selecting evidence from notes to include on the Record-of-Evidence form

2a. How do assessors select the pieces of evidence to appear on a Record-of-Evidence form? Do they encounter any problems when they carry out this task? If so, how do they handle those problems?

2a1. Can each piece of evidence on the Record-of-Evidence form be clearly traced to one or more statements found in a documentation source (i.e., Class Profile, Instruction Profile, Preobservation Interview, Class Observation Record, Postobservation Interview)?

2a2. Does the record of evidence for each criterion contain examples of specific behaviors, events, interactions, etc.?

2a3. Do all the pieces of evidence cited for a criterion clearly pertain to that criterion?

2a4. Were there instances in which assessors retrieved no evidence for a criterion in their notes but, while completing the Record-of-Evidence form, remembered things that happened in the classroom or during the interviews that pertained to a criterion?

2a5. Does the record of evidence contain evidence from multiple documentation sources (i.e., Class Profile, Instruction Profile, Preobservation Interview, Class Observation Record, Postobservation Interview)?

2a6. Does the evidence cited support the rating given?

2b. Do two assessors who have observed and interviewed the same candidate retrieve similar evidence from their notes to include on the Record-of-Evidence form? Are the "major" pieces of evidence the two assessors cite for a criterion similar? How much variability is there across the two assessors in the supporting evidence cited for a criterion?

3. Weighing the evidence on the Record-of-Evidence form to produce a rating

3a. How do assessors decide which pieces of evidence are more compelling than others when they are weighing the evidence? How do assessors determine what constitutes a "preponderance of evidence" for a specific criterion?

3b. Do assessors have difficulty reconciling conflicting pieces of evidence? If so, how do they deal with conflicting pieces of evidence when they weigh the evidence?

3c. When assessors weigh pieces of evidence that are drawn from more than one documentation source (i.e., Class Profile, Instruction Profile, Preobservation Interview, Class Observation Record, Postobservation Interview), how do they weigh the importance of the sources in relation to each other?

3d. Do assessors draw upon specialized knowledge and understanding of various elements of the teaching context (i.e., subject matter expertise, familiarity with students the age of those being observed, familiarity with the community culture in which the school is set, familiarity with the candidate's teaching method[s] and style) when they weigh the evidence and rate the candidate on the criteria? If so, how? Which elements come into play for which criteria? If an assessor lacked knowledge and understanding of one of these elements, would this hinder his or her ability to rate the candidate on certain criteria? If so, which criteria?

3e. If two assessors observe and interview the same candidate and one of the assessors has specialized knowledge of the teaching context (i.e., subject matter expertise, familiarity with students the age of those being observed, familiarity with the community culture in which the school is set, familiarity with the candidate's teaching method[s] and style) but the other does not, do the two assessors weigh various pieces of evidence and/or score criteria differently?

3f. Did assessors find some criteria more difficult to score than others? If so, which ones?

3g. Did assessors find that some scoring rules were unclear and not easy to apply? If so, which ones? What about them was unclear? Why were they difficult to apply?

3h. How do assessors react to using a 6-point scale? Did the 6-point scale seem reasonable, or would they have preferred fewer (or more) points? Were assessors comfortable having scale points 0, 2, and 4 defined for each rating scale but not points 1, 3, and 5? Would they have preferred fewer (or more) definitions for scale points? Did they have any difficulty understanding the distinctions between scale points for any of the rating scales? If so, which ones?

3i. Did assessors feel confident in the rating they gave the candidate on each criterion? Which ratings do assessors feel confident about, and which do they feel a lack of confidence about? If they don't feel confident about a rating, why do they feel that way? How confident were assessors in making pass/fail decisions for each criterion? How confident were assessors in making decisions above the 2 point on the scale?

3j. Do two assessors who have observed and interviewed the same candidate give the candidate similar ratings on the criteria? Does one assessor within the pair give consistently higher or lower ratings than the other? If so, why does this seem to have occurred?

A research plan, which contained the questions and outlines of Formative Studies B1-B6, was circulated to ETS staff for their review and comment. Table 1 identifies the particular studies that addressed the various research questions. Included below is a brief description of formative studies B1-B6 and the purposes each study served.

Formative Study B1. Assessors completed a questionnaire as they engaged in the rating process. After the assessors rated the candidate on each criterion, they filled out a page of the questionnaire to reflect on that process. Myford and Lehman (1993a) analyzed the assessors' questionnaire responses in order to determine how much difficulty assessors experienced in rating the candidate on each criterion, what problems assessors encountered, and how much confidence they had in the ratings produced.

Table 1: Research Questions Addressed by Formative Studies B1-B6

| | STUDY B1 | STUDY B2 | STUDY B3 | STUDY B4 | STUDY B5 | STUDY B6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1a | | • | • | • | • | |
| 1a1 | | | • | | | |
| 1a2 | | | • | | | |
| 1a3 | | | • | | | |
| 1a4 | | | • | | | |
| 1b | • | • | | • | • | |
| 1b1 | • | • | | | • | |
| 1b2 | | | | | • | |
| 1b3 | | • | | | • | |
| 1b4 | • | • | | | | |
| 2a | • | • | • | • | • | |
| 2a1 | | | • | | | |
| 2a2 | | | • | | | • |
| 2a3 | | | • | | | • |
| 2a4 | • | • | | | | |
| 2a5 | | | • | | | • |
| 2a6 | | | | | | • |
| 2b | | | | • | | • |
| 3a | | • | | • | | |
| 3b | • | • | | | • | |
| 3c | | • | | | | |
| 3d | • | • | | | • | |
| 3e | | | | • | | |
| 3f | • | • | | | • | |
| 3g | • | • | | | • | |
| 3h | • | • | | | • | |
| 3i | • | • | | | | |
| 3j | | | | • | | |

Formative Study B2. These case studies were designed to provide an in-depth look at how two assessors used the measurement tools to make their judgments. Reynolds (1993a) interviewed two assessors and tape recorded their comments as they described retrospectively how they carried out the assessment process. The study had several purposes: (a) to understand how the two assessors executed the tasks of taking and coding notes, selecting evidence from notes to include on the Record-of-Evidence form, and analyzing and weighing that evidence to arrive at a final rating for a criterion, (b) to develop hypotheses about important similarities and differences in how assessors process

information when using a high-inference assessment system, (c) to understand how differences in approach can affect the ratings assessors give on four criteria, one from each domain, and (d) to provide recommendations for improving the assessment process, especially the training of assessors.

Formative Study B3. Individual assessors conducted an evaluation of their own assessment documentation (i.e., their classroom observation notes, interview notes, and Record-of-Evidence form). Assessors completed a work sheet that guided them through the evaluation of those documents and provided feedback on the extent to which they had met some of the goals of assessor training. Myford and Lehman (1993b) collected the work sheets and analyzed the responses in order to identify and examine differences across assessors in the perceived quality of their documentation.

Formative Study B4. After the assessors completed the assessment cycle, the pairs met to explain to one another how each observed, took notes, coded notes, and selected evidence to include on the Record-of-Evidence forms. These tape-recorded discussions between pairs of assessors were guided by a set of stimulus questions. Morris and Jones (1993) analyzed the assessor pair discussions to document the processes the assessors used and the problems they encountered and to gain an understanding of the similarities and differences between assessors in the way they carried out the assessment process.

Formative Study B5. The assessors met to share their comments and concerns regarding the experience of conducting an assessment cycle. Assessors participated in small- and large-group discussions of various issues. Reynolds (1993b) tape recorded the discussions and analyzed them to gain a better understanding of the kinds of problems assessors encountered in evaluating the candidate, how they handled those problems when they occurred, and their suggestions for improving the assessment process.

Formative Study B6. Camp and Mandinach (1993) independently reviewed the assessors' completed Record-of-Evidence forms to determine whether assessors differed in the evidence they cited and whether records of evidence differed in their effectiveness as

assessment documents. The researchers conducted a qualitative analysis of the differences they observed and identified a number of issues to be considered in assessors' preparation and in their use of the Record-of-Evidence forms. The study pinpointed questions to be considered in relation to the issues raised and made recommendations for assessors' preparation and practice.

Formative Study C

One of the principles guiding the development of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments is that to be effective in our increasingly multicultural society, teachers must teach their students in a culturally responsive manner. The overall goal of this study was to explore the extent to which Praxis III addresses relevant cultural issues in the teaching-learning process. Two major questions guided this investigation:

1. To what extent do the various instruments enable assessors to collect data regarding the candidate's ability to teach students of diverse cultural backgrounds?

2. How effective is the training program in preparing assessors to recognize cultural aspects of the teaching-learning situation, and to collect and code evidence for these cultural aspects?

Separate technical reports are available for each of the formative studies. (See reference list at the end of this report.) Readers are encouraged to contact ETS to order copies of reports that are of interest to them.

The next section of this report describes the methodology used to gather and analyze data for the formative studies.

## Methodology

Setting and Participants

ETS contacted representatives from the Delaware Department of Public Instruction and the Minnesota Board of Teaching to determine whether their states would be interested in collaborating with ETS to develop Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. After initial discussions, the officials in the two states indicated their desire to become partners in designing and pilot testing the performance assessments. Plans were made for educators in these states to participate in the formative evaluation of the proposed assessment system. The pilot testing was conducted at three sites during the latter part of 1991: (a) Minneapolis, Minnesota, November 3-6; (b) Dover, Delaware, November 17-20; and (c) Minneapolis, Minnesota, December 9–12.

At each site, 12 assessors participated in the study. Six of these assessors were ETS staff members from test development, research, and program administration, and six were involved in teaching, teacher education, and/or assessment in Delaware or Minnesota. Each ETS staff member had taken part in the design and development of the classroom performance assessments. The assessors from the two states were recommended by the Delaware Department of Public Instruction and the Minnesota Board of Teaching. ETS asked representatives of these organizations to recommend highly qualified educators in their state to be involved in the pilot testing. The representatives were asked to take into consideration the need to maintain gender/racial/ethnic/geographic/teacher union diversity in the assessor sample. All of the assessors had been through an assessor training program prior to the study.

Assessor training program. The assessor training program consisted of a five-day experience including field work. The program was designed to enable educators to make professionally defensible judgments regarding the classroom performance of beginning teachers. It involved a series of structured activities in which trainees learned to recognize the presence--or absence--of each of the criteria in a range of educational settings. As part

of learning to recognize the criteria in a range of contexts, assessors-in-training acquired skills in using various methods for collecting information about teaching performance: evaluating written information provided by the teacher, taking accurate notes during classroom observation, and conducting semistructured interviews. Participants practiced each of these skills separately before applying them to the assessment process. The assessor training program utilized different stimuli, as appropriate, for the different exercises. These included work sheets, sample records of evidence, simulations, case studies, and videotapes. As they progressed through the training program, participants received feedback on their work from the instructor, from fellow participants, and from the answer keys to the exercises themselves. (For a more detailed description of the assessor training program, see Appendix C.)

Characteristics of the assessors. In order to provide background and experiential information, each assessor filled out an Assessor Profile. Table 2 summarizes selected background characteristics of the 36 assessors who participated in the pilot studies.

Assessors also provided general information about their knowledge and understanding of various aspects of the teaching situation they observed. Specifically, we asked each assessor the following questions: (a) How much knowledge and understanding do you have of the subject matter the candidate taught? (b) How much knowledge and understanding do you have of characteristics of students who are in the age range of those the candidate teaches (i.e., how they differ in abilities; their stages of physical, social, cognitive, personality, and moral development)? (c) How much knowledge and understanding do you have of the type of community culture in which the candidate's school is set? (d) How much knowledge and understanding do you have of the candidate's teaching method(s) and style? For each question, the assessor selected one of three options: (a) little or none, (b) some, or (c) much. Table 3 summarizes the assessors' responses to these questions.

Table 2: Background Characteristics of the Assessors ($N = 36$)

| | *f* | % | | *f* | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | | **Current Status** | | |
| 25 - 34 | 1 | 3 | College faculty | 2 | 6 |
| 35 - 44 | 16 | 44 | State administrator | 1 | 3 |
| 45 - 54 | 17 | 47 | Classroom teacher | 4 | 11 |
| 55 - 64 | 2 | 6 | Classroom teacher, special assignment | 9 | 25 |
| | | | Other[1] | 19 | 53 |
| **Racial/Ethnic Background** | | | No response | 1 | 3 |
| African American | 1 | 3 | | | |
| Hispanic | 3 | 8 | | | |
| Caucasian | 32 | 89 | **Years of teaching experience** | | |
| | | | 6 - 10 years | 12 | 33 |
| | | | 11 - 15 years | 7 | 19 |
| **Highest Degree Held** | | | 16 - 20 years | 4 | 11 |
| Bachelor's | 4 | 11 | 21 or more years | 11 | 31 |
| Master's | 4 | 11 | No response | 2 | 6 |
| Master's with additional course work | 14 | 39 | | | |
| Doctorate | 12 | 33 | **Sex** | | |
| No response | 2 | 6 | Female | 32 | 89 |
| | | | Male | 4 | 11 |

[1] Most of the persons who used this category were ETS staff members who listed the following job titles: researcher, test developer, educational consultant, and program administrator. Additionally, several of the assessors from Delaware and Minnesota used this category, listing job titles such as educational consultant, staff development director, and lead mentor.

Table 3: Background Knowledge of Assessors by Site

| Item | Response | Site 1 *f* | Site 2 *f* | Site 3 *f* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Assessor knowledge and understanding of *subject matter* taught by candidate | Little or none | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| | Some | 4 | 8 | 5 |
| | Much | 7 | 2 | 5 |
| Assessor knowledge and understanding of *characteristics of students* in the age range taught by the candidate | Little or none | 0 | 4 | 0 |
| | Some | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| | Much | 8 | 3 | 7 |
| Assessor knowledge and understanding of type of *community culture* in which the candidate's school is set | Little or none | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | Some | 5 | 4 | 2 |
| | Much | 5 | 8 | 9 |
| Assessor knowledge and understanding of candidate's *teaching method and style* | Little or none | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| | Some | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| | Much | 9 | 6 | 7 |

Characteristics of the candidates. Each candidate who participated in the study filled out a Candidate Profile that provided information about his or her background, training, and experience. Table 4 summarizes the background characteristics of the 18 candidates. Each candidate prepared and taught a lesson which two assessors observed. Assessors viewed a diverse set of lessons taught at a number of grade levels in a variety of subject matters.

Characteristics of the classes. Table 5 lists the grades the candidates taught, the subject matter, and the lesson topics for the 18 lessons. Table 6 summarizes the background characteristics of the students in these classes.

Table 4: Background Characteristics of the Candidates ($N = 18$)

| | *f* | % | | *f* | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Age** | | | **Primary Teaching Assignment** | | |
| Under 25 | 5 | 28 | All or most elementary subjects | 6 | 33 |
| 25 - 34 | 12 | 67 | All or most middle school subjects | 2 | 11 |
| 35 - 44 | 1 | 5 | Special Education | 1 | 5 |
| | | | Arts (Music) | 1 | 5 |
| **Sex** | | | Mathematics and computer science | 2 | 11 |
| Female | 12 | 67 | Physical/biological sciences | 2 | 11 |
| Male | 6 | 33 | Social sciences | 1 | 5 |
| | | | Business and vocational education | 2 | 11 |
| **Racial/Ethnic Background** | | | Health and physical education | 1 | 5 |
| Caucasian | 18 | 100 | | | |
| **Highest Degree Held** | | | **Type of School in Which You Teach**[1] | | |
| Less than a Bachelor's | 6 | 33 | | | |
| Bachelor's | 12 | 67 | Elementary | 7 | 39 |
| | | | Middle | 4 | 22 |
| **Current Status** | | | Junior High | 5 | 28 |
| Student Teacher | 6 | 33 | High School | 5 | 28 |
| First -Year Teacher | 12 | 67 | | | |
| **Amount of Teaching Experience** | | | **Type of Community in Which You Teach** | | |
| Less than one year | 12 | 67 | Urban | 10 | 56 |
| 1 - 2 years | 4 | 22 | Suburban | 7 | 39 |
| 3 - 4 years[2] | 1 | 5 | No response | 1 | 5 |
| No response | 1 | 5 | | | |

[1] Three candidates noted that they were teaching in more than one type of school. One candidate taught in both elementary and senior high, a second taught in a middle school and an alternative high school, and a third taught in both elementary and junior high. Therefore, the three candidates are counted twice in these totals.

[2] The one candidate who checked 3-4 years noted that this was substitute teaching experience.

Table 5: Content of Lessons Taught

| Grade Level | Site[1] | Subject Matter | Lesson Topic |
|---|---|---|---|
| **ELEMENTARY** | | | |
| Kindergarten | 1 | Language Arts | a series of short activities involving the language arts: weather-related activities, story telling activities with puppets to introduce the letter g |
| Grade 2 | 2 | Science | a lesson on shadows to teach that opaque objects block light and cast shadows |
| Grade 2 | 2 | Language Arts | a lesson on adjectives--define adjective, describe what an adjective is, write sentences containing adjectives |
| **MIDDLE SCHOOL/ JUNIOR HIGH** | | | |
| Grade 5 | 2 | Language Arts | a lesson on learning to write and follow a sequential set of directions |
| Grade 5 | 2 | Mathematics | a lesson on how to use a sum to find a missing addend |
| Grades 5-6 | 1 | Geography | a lesson on map reading to evaluate students' application of skills learned--using coordinates, scales, symbols, etc. |
| Grade 6 | 3 | Business Education | drill and practice of keyboarding skills |
| Grade 6 | 1 | Science | a lesson on the circulatory system |
| Grade 6 | 1 | Reading | an oral reading lesson |
| Grade 7 | 3 | Mathematics | a lesson on how to use properties to simplify and solve problems involving formulas |
| Grade 7 | 2 | Life Sciences | a lesson on the two methods for identifying organisms--taxonomies and field guides |
| Grades 7-8 | 3 | Vocal Music | a rehearsal of several songs students had been practicing |
| Grade 8 | 1 | Special Education | a lesson on social relations--discrimination, prejudice, and oppression |
| Grade 8 | 1 | Mathematics | a lesson on tessellation, rotation, and symmetry |
| **HIGH SCHOOL** | | | |
| Grade 9 | 3 | Social Studies | a civics lesson on the presidency |
| Grades 9-10 | 3 | Drivers Education | a lesson on night driving and driving in bad weather |
| Grades 9-12 | 2 | Physical Education | drill and practice of the basic skills of basketball |
| Grades 10-11 | 3 | General Biology | a lesson on organic chemistry and its relationship to biology |

[1] Pilot testing was carried out in three sites: (a) Minneapolis, Minnesota on November 3-6, 1991, (b) Dover, Delaware on November 17-20, 1991, and (c) Minneapolis, Minnesota on December 9-12, 1991.

Table 6: Background Characteristics of the Students ($N = 412$)[1]

| | *f* | % | | *f* | % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Racial/Ethnic Background** | | | **Type of Residential Area** | | |
| Asian or Asian American | 33 | 8 | Urban | 220 | 53 |
| Black or African American | 90 | 22 | Suburban | 175 | 42 |
| Hispanic | 6 | 1 | Rural | 17 | 4 |
| Native American | 12 | 3 | | | |
| Caucasian | 271 | 66 | **First Language** | | |
| | | | English | 387 | 94 |
| **Sex** | | | Not English | 25 | 6 |
| Female | 217 | 53 | | | |
| Male | 195 | 47 | | | |

[1] Table 6 summarizes the background data of students from 16 of the 18 classes observed. Data were not available for two of the classes.

Procedure

ETS researchers planned and designed a series of activities to gather information about the strengths of the assessment system as well as those areas needing improvement. These activities were scheduled to take place over a four-day period in each of the three sites. Included below is a brief description of the activities for each day.

Day 1. The 12 assessors met to be briefed about the various assessment activities. An ETS researcher provided an overview of the formative studies and explained each of the activities that the assessors would carry out. The assessors were assigned to work in pairs, each pair consisting of an ETS staff member and an assessor from the state (i.e., Delaware or Minnesota). The assessor pairs were introduced, and the pairs finalized arrangements for their observations in the schools scheduled for the following day.

Day 2. Each assessor pair conducted one assessment cycle. They interviewed the candidate prior to the observation, reviewed his or her Instruction Profile and Class Profile, observed the candidate teaching a class, and then conducted a postobservation interview with the candidate. In the interviews, one assessor conducted the interview, but both took notes. The assessors were asked not to confer with one another during the assessment cycle. Once they had completed the observation, each assessor coded his or her classroom observation and interview notes, identifying pieces of evidence which pertained to the various criteria. The assessors then filled out the Record-of-Evidence form, selecting evidence from their

notes to place under the various criteria listed on the form. Finally, they reviewed the evidence and then used the scoring rule for each criterion to assign a rating for the criterion.

While they were completing the Record-of-Evidence form, the assessors filled out a questionnaire that solicited information from them about how much difficulty they experienced in rating the candidate on each criteria, what problems they encountered when working with the evidence for the criterion, and how much confidence they had in each rating produced (Formative Study B1). At the first site, one assessor pair met with an ETS researcher after they had completed their ratings to describe retrospectively the coding, selecting, and rating processes they used for four predetermined criteria. The researcher used an semistructured interview protocol to guide the discussion. The discussion was tape recorded for later analysis (Formative Study B2).

Day 3. Each assessor was given a work sheet to complete. The work sheet was designed to help the assessor evaluate the quality of his or her classroom observation notes, interview notes, and Record-of-Evidence form (Formative Study B3).

Later that morning, the assessor pairs met to discuss similarities and differences in their approaches to carrying out the assessment process. Each pair completed a work sheet that contained a series of questions designed to focus the assessor pair's discussion of their notes, their Record-of-Evidence forms, and their ratings. Their discussions were tape recorded for later analysis (Formative Study B4).

After lunch, the assessors met in groups to discuss problems they encountered when carrying out the assessment process and strategies they employed to handle those problems when they occurred. The assessors discussed their reactions to the assessment process and shared their suggestions for improving it. An ETS assessor served as a facilitator in each of the small-group sessions and in the large group and posed the questions for discussion. The discussions were tape recorded for later analysis (Formative Study B5).

Day 4. Three activities related to Formative Study C (cultural diversity) were carried out during the morning of Day 4. First, each assessor was asked to highlight all evidence of cultural diversity found in his or her data. This highlighting was done directly on the completed data-collection instrument and Record-of-Evidence form. Second, the assessor pairs were asked to compare their data to determine which instruments enabled them to gather evidence for the candidate's ability to teach students of diverse backgrounds. Last there was a whole-group discussion focused on relevant cultural diversity themes.

In the afternoon, the assessors evaluated the various instruments they had employed to gather information about the candidate (Formative Study A). They completed five questionnaires, each one designed to gather their reactions to one of the assessment instruments.

## Results

In this section of the paper, we highlight major findings from each of the formative studies. The interested reader is encouraged to contact ETS to order copies of individual research reports for each of the formative studies. These reports contain a more detailed presentation of the findings of individual studies as well as a discussion of the implications of those findings for improving the assessment system. As an aid in understanding the summary of findings, the reader may want to refer to Appendix E, which contains a copy of the criterion descriptions and scoring rules that were in effect during the pilot tests.

### Formative Study A

The purpose of this study was to determine the adequacy of the five data-collection instruments used in Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments (Class Profile, Instruction Profile, Preobservation Interview, Class Observation Record, and Postobservation Interview). During each round of data collection (twice in Minnesota and once in Delaware), the assessors completed questionnaires containing open-ended items designed to obtain their feedback on each instrument.

The development team analyzed the assessors' comments and suggestions after the initial round of fieldwork in both Minnesota and Delaware and revised all five instruments on the basis of this feedback. Subsequently, the revised instruments were field tested again in Minnesota using a different set of assessors, teachers, and classrooms. This strategy enabled ETS to test the instruments twice, thereby maximizing the impact of the study. The findings are summarized below by instrument. In keeping with the two-stage strategy described above, the results for each instrument are summarized in two parts (first field test and second field test). To aid in understanding this discussion, the reader may want to refer to Appendix G, which contains copies of the instruments/forms used in the pilot testing and to Appendix H, which contains the most recent version of the instruments/forms.

Class Profile: First field test. The overall purpose and use of the instrument was clear to nearly all assessors. Generally, the assessors felt that the information sought by the instrument was important. Nevertheless, they suggested several changes to improve the instrument.

According to the assessors, the format of this instrument was not confusing to candidates. When candidates appeared confused, the problem was usually a lack of clarity regarding the intent of the question, and not the format of the instrument itself. Assessors made suggestions to improve the clarity of the problematic questions. Proposed changes included clarifying key terms, rewording items, deleting items that were considered irrelevant to the assessment, and adding other relevant items that had been omitted.

Overall, about one-fourth of the assessors believed they had not received adequate training regarding how the information contained in this form was to be used in the assessment process. On the basis of this finding, they recommended that the training program illustrate how assessors are to use the information generated by the Class Profile in the assessment process.

Class Profile: Second field test. During the second field test in Minnesota, all assessors reported understanding the purpose of the instrument and its use in determining the context for the assessment. In their view, the changes made in the instrument helped candidates give more accurate and useful information. Assessors suggested several other changes after the second field test including simplifying items, rewording items, and deleting certain items.

Instruction Profile: First field test. All assessors involved in the initial field test had a clear understanding of the intended use of the Instruction Profile. The assessors found all the items important in that they sought information that was needed to score the candidate on various Praxis III criteria.

All but one of the assessors indicated that the provision of lesson materials was helpful in evaluating the candidate. The major problem was that candidates did not give

sufficient detail about their instructional plans. The assessors felt that candidates must be given more detailed directions on how to complete this form adequately. Additionally, assessors thought that candidates should be required to include copies of lesson materials and evaluation activities with their completed Instruction Profile. Assessors recommended that the importance of including these materials with the Instruction Plan be made clear to candidates.

For the most part, candidates did not appear to have difficulty understanding the format of the Instruction Profile. However, approximately one-fifth of the candidates across the two sites did not appear to understand what was expected of them in completing this form. In these cases, the candidate provided information that was very general, thereby forcing assessors to spend an inordinate amount of time probing for details in the preobservation interview.

About one-fourth of the assessors reported that the assessor training they had received had not stressed the function of this specific instrument in the overall assessment process. But, in their view, the form is easy enough to interpret. Assessors made two specific recommendations for the training program: (a) include a discussion of acceptable evaluation strategies and whether assessors must actually observe the evaluation; (b) discuss the instrument question by question rather than holistically; and (c) demonstrate how to probe for missing information on this form during the preobservation interview.

Instruction Profile: Second field test. All assessors reported having a clear understanding of the intended use of the form. They suggested several revisions to strengthen the instrument. The assessors felt the instrument provided critical evidence of a candidate's teaching competence.

All assessors indicated that the provision of lesson materials was helpful in evaluating the candidate. All but one of the participating candidates appeared to understand what was expected of them in completing this form, the assessors felt. None of the

assessors had to spend a significant amount of time during the preobservation interviews probing for more details regarding the candidate's instructional plan.

Preobservation Interview: First field test. All assessors reported having a clear understanding of the purpose of the preobservation interview and how questions on the form relate to the evaluation criteria, but they felt that the instrument needed extensive revisions in order to fulfill its purpose. First, they noted that the instrument, as originally field tested, used language that was too stilted. The assessors recommended three types of changes: (a) rewording questions to make them more conversational; (b) adding probes directly on the form to remind the assessor to collect all relevant information; and (c) adding several questions regarding issues of cultural diversity.

Nearly one-fifth of the candidates across the two sites appeared not to understand what was expected of them during the preobservation interview. Especially problematic were the questions asking candidates to explain why they had chosen a particular set of materials, learning activities, or evaluation strategy. According to the assessors, one of the reasons for the confusion was the rigid wording of the questions. A second reason was that the candidates did not know beforehand what questions assessors would ask in the interview. The assessors suggested that the candidate be given a list of questions for the preobservation interview before he or she participates in the first assessment cycle.

The assessors identified a number of difficulties in conducting the interviews including taking notes during the interview, using probes, and keeping candidates focused on the questions. To deal with these concerns, they recommended that the training program give more attention to interviewing techniques. Assessors also believed that the interview would flow more easily if the interview questions were made more conversational and if probes were included directly on the instrument.

Preobservation Interview: Second field test. The assessors were not as critical of the instrument used in the second field test as they had been of the original instrument.

Overall, nearly all assessors felt that the new instrument worked well. Nevertheless, they recommended several revisions.

The assessors agreed that candidates benefited from receiving the list of interview questions prior to the interview. This seemed to help keep the candidates remain focused throughout the interview; but some assessors continued to have difficulties probing for information, keeping candidates focused, and taking notes during the interview while maintaining rapport with the candidate. These findings suggest that interviewing skills are difficult to acquire and that the assessor training program will need to pay special attention to this critical information-gathering method.

Class Observation Record: First field test. Assessors use this form to take descriptive notes during classroom observations. Two versions of the form were tested, one lined and the other unlined. All assessors indicated that they had a clear understanding of the purpose of this form and how it was to be used. The assessors generally preferred the lined form. Most claimed that the lines facilitated the note taking. Overall, they considered the format of the Class Observation Record to be suitable for its purpose. Nevertheless, they suggested several revisions to render the form more usable.

There was wide variation in the number of pages assessors used to describe the observed lessons. The number of pages ranged from 3 to 15, with an average of 10 pages per observation. All but one of the assessors were able to take sufficient notes during the observations to score the candidates on relevant criteria. Only one assessor reported note taking difficulties, but those assessors who felt secure about their note taking skills encountered several difficulties: having difficulty hearing some important comments students made, recording all relevant information during transitions between learning activities, and capturing accurately important nonverbal interactions.

All assessors felt that the training had prepared them well to use the Class Observation Record. They made several suggestions in order to strengthen the portion of the assessor training program dealing with this instrument including giving more attention

to note taking during transition points during the lesson, especially to how teachers end activities and introduce new ones; standardizing the use of abbreviations for students' race/ethnicity and gender (e.g., HM for Hispanic male); having one of the trainers complete a Class Observation Record for a 15-minute portion of a training session and using this as a model of good note taking; and giving more practice in note taking during the training.

Class Observation Record: Second field test. All assessors found the revised form an improvement over the original form. All but one assessor indicated that they were able to take sufficient notes during the observation to score candidates on relevant criteria.

Assessors continued to experience problems when taking notes. Some had difficulty keeping up with fast-paced interactions, and at times they forgot to note the gender of the student involved in the various interactions. They suggested that the training program for assessors focus more attention on note taking (e.g., using abbreviations, deciding when to summarize actions and when to script dialogues). Assessors again reported having difficulty hearing some students.

Postobservation Interview: First field test. All assessors reported having a clear understanding of the purpose of the instrument and the relationship between the interview questions and the performance criteria. Nevertheless, they suggested a number of important revisions, most of which entailed rewording questions to make the interview more like a conversation with a colleague than a test.

All the assessors indicated that candidates appeared to understand what was expected of them in the interview. However, they felt that the interview process might be improved if candidates had a list of the interview questions to help focus their comments. Assessors also recommended that the candidates have a copy of their Instruction Profile to refer to during the interview.

According to the assessors, candidates experienced difficulty responding to the questions that required reflecting on their own teaching (questions 1-3 in the field-tested version of the Postobservation Interview form). Candidates seemed self-conscious when

assessing their own performance. When a candidate offered such self-assessment, the response generally required much probing by the assessor. The major problem seemed to be that the wording of the questions was "too rigid" or "test like" to engage candidates in self-reflection. The assessors recommended changing the wording of these questions. For example, instead of asking, "To what extent do you feel you accomplished your goals/objectives," ask, "How do you think the lesson went?"

Assessors encountered several problems during the interview: note taking (e.g., detailed notes were considered to interfere with rapport); and probing for more information. Because of incomplete note taking, several assessors reported not having the necessary information for scoring candidates on a few performance criteria.

All but two of the assessors indicated that the training gave them an understanding of the purpose of the interview. However, slightly more than one-third of the group reported that the training had not addressed clearly the intention of each question, and nearly half of the group thought they had not received sufficient training in how to use interview data in scoring the candidate. Discussions of the relationship between the various interview items and the performance items are also needed, assessors felt. Additionally, they suggested that more role-playing and actual interviewing experience were necessary to refine interview skills.

Postobservation Interview: Second field test. All but one of the assessors considered the revised instrument to be a significant improvement over the original one. Assessors suggested a few additional revisions.

Several assessors reported having difficulty seeing the relationship between the performance criteria and certain questions on the interview form. Some assessors encountered problems during the interview, including using probes, keeping candidates focused on the interview questions, and taking notes during the interview. The assessors suggested that the assessor training program should be revised to address these concerns.

Formative Study B1

In this study, assessors completed a questionnaire as they engaged in the rating process. The purpose of the study was to gather information from assessors about how much difficulty they experienced in rating the candidate on each criterion, what problems they encountered, and how much confidence they had in their ratings.

Assessors identified a number of problems that they encountered when gathering and selecting evidence for the criteria including lacking evidence for some criteria, having to infer evidence for some criteria, having difficulty knowing whether certain pieces of evidence really pertained to a given criterion, and having conflicting evidence for a criterion. When rating the candidate's performance, assessors frequently reported having difficulty distinguishing between the meanings of scale points, and they felt a number of scoring rules were too vague. Assessors also reported a number of instances in which they believed the candidate deserved a rating different from the one the scoring rule produced.

Assessors in the third site more frequently reported that they needed, but lacked, expertise in the subject matter taught than did assessors in the other two sites. Assessors found that their lack of subject matter expertise particularly hindered their ability to rate the candidates on criteria A1 (Demonstrating application of content knowledge through accurate instruction) and A2 (Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was studied previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be studied in the future). Assessors' lack of knowledge and understanding of the characteristics of students who are of the age of those the candidate taught posed some problems for assessors, particularly those in the second site.

After the assessor had rated the candidate on a criterion, the assessor was asked to respond to the question, "How difficult did you find it to rate the candidate on this criterion?" The assessor could check one of three options: (1) easy, (2) moderately difficult, or (3) very difficult. The assessor was then asked "How confident are you in your judgment?" The assessors responded using one of four options: (1) very



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

confident/comfortable with the decision, (2) somewhat confident/comfortable with the decision, (3) somewhat uncertain/uncomfortable with the decision, or (4) very uncertain/uncomfortable with the decision.

The means for degree of difficulty ranged from 1.2 for criterion D4 (Building professional relationships) to 1.9 for criterion D3 (Demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for student learning). All were in the "easy" to "moderately difficult" range. Overall, assessors identified criteria C1 (Creating a purposeful and well-functioning learning community), C5 (Establishing and maintaining rapport), and D4 (Building professional relationships) as somewhat easier to rate, while they viewed criteria B2 (Helping students activate relevant aspects of their prior knowledge, skills, and culture resources), D1 (Reflecting on the extent to which the instructional goals were met), and D3 (Demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for student learning) as somewhat more difficult to rate.

The means for confidence in judgment ranged from 1.6 for criteria C1 (Creating a purposeful and well-functioning learning community) and D4 (Building professional relationships) to 2.3 for criterion D3 (Demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for student learning). All were in the "somewhat confident/comfortable with the decision" to "very confident/comfortable with the decision" range.

We determined that the mean confidence levels differed across sites ($F = 14.77$, $df = 2,712$, $p < .001$). The means for sites 1, 2, and 3 were 1.70, 1.92, and 2.11, respectively. The Tukey-HSD procedure revealed that all unique pairs of means were significantly different. Therefore, we concluded that assessors in Site 1 were significantly more confident in their ratings than assessors in Site 2 and in Site 3. Of the three groups, assessors in Site 3 were the least confident of all.

We computed the mean confidence ratings for assessors at each rating point on the 0-5 scale. To compute these means, we separated the assessors' ratings of the candidates on the criteria into five sets--candidate ratings of 1, candidate ratings of 2, candidate ratings

of 3, candidate ratings of 4, and candidate ratings of 5. (It should be noted that no assessors gave a rating of 0 at any of the sites, and no assessors at Site 2 gave a rating of 5.). Each candidate rating had a confidence rating associated with it which indicated how confident the assessor felt about the candidate rating that he or she had given. For each set of candidate ratings, we took the corresponding confidence ratings and computed their mean. The analysis showed that the lower the assessor's rating of the candidate, the more uncertain the assessor was about his/her judgment. A candidate rating of 1 had the lowest confidence level of all. Conversely, the higher the candidate rating, the greater the assessor's confidence in that rating.

In this study, we proposed a variety of approaches that could be adopted to deal with the problems that assessors encountered when they used the assessment system. Listed below are brief descriptions of approaches we suggested.

Problems: Assessors had little or no evidence for some criteria, had to infer evidence for certain criteria, did not know whether certain evidence pertained to a given criteria, and had difficulty reconciling conflicting evidence for a criterion.

Suggested approaches for working with these problems:

1. Review criterion descriptions to make certain that we have pinpointed the sources the assessor should consult to locate evidence for a given criterion. This could help ensure that assessors would not overlook potential sources as they mine their notes for evidence (e.g., the Preobservation Interview, the Instruction Profile, etc.).
2. Examine the assessment methodologies and the assessment instruments that are employed in this assessment system to determine whether they are appropriate for gathering evidence for each of the criteria. Revise certain questions on the instruments or include additional questions to create more possibilities for gathering evidence for problematic criteria.

3. Reconsider whether it is reasonable to expect assessors to find evidence for each of the criteria in a typical assessment cycle.
4. Review the evidence assessors have collected for each criterion to make certain that it is feasible to gather direct evidence for each one.
5. Work with assessors to help them understand the differences between direct and inferred evidence. Alert assessors to the critical difference between the two, and give assessors practice in distinguishing between them.
6. Furnish assessor trainees with examples of different kinds of evidence that assessors have gathered for each criterion to acquaint them with examples of what evidence for a given criterion might look like in a variety of teaching contexts.
7. Devise guidelines that the assessor could refer to when he or she needs help in weighing positive and negative evidence for a criterion.
8. Identify some examples from actual Record-of-Evidence forms that show conflicting evidence for a criterion and engage assessors in discussions of those examples to give them practice in dealing with such situations.

Problems: Assessors had difficulty understanding the distinctions between scale points for a number of the scoring rules and felt that some of the scoring rules were too vague.

Suggested approaches for working with the problems:

1. For problematic criteria, revise the descriptions of scale points so that they more clearly differentiate between levels of performance.
2. Provide assessors with some Record-of-Evidence forms that could serve as anchors for each criterion--clear examples that vividly illustrate differences between the various levels of performance.
3. Provide assessors with opportunities for guided practice in applying the scoring rules so that they can learn to recognize the distinctions between the levels of performance

Problem: Assessors had difficulty rating candidates on certain criteria --B2 (Helping students activate relevant aspects of their prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultural resources), D1 (Reflecting on the extent to which the instructional goals were met), and D3 (Demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for student learning).

Suggested approaches for working with the problem:

1. Review the responses assessors made in their large- and small-group discussions to questions that were posed concerning criteria that were difficult to rate. Use the assessors' insights to guide revisions of criteria descriptions and/or scoring rules for the hard-to-rate criteria.

Problem: The lower the rating the assessor gave, the lower the assessor's confidence in the rating given.

Suggested approaches for working with the problem:

1. Review the scoring rules to make certain that we have clearly defined the difference between minimally acceptable performance and unacceptable performance.
2. Draft specific guidelines to help assessors make the critical determinations between minimally acceptable and unacceptable performance.
3. Supply assessors with examples gleaned from records of evidence for candidates who demonstrated unacceptable performance and for some who demonstrated minimally acceptable performance so that assessors will have some examples to compare when they are called upon to make these judgments.

Problem: Some assessors found that their lack of understanding of certain aspects of the teaching context hindered their ability to rate the candidate they observed.

Suggested approaches for working with the problem:

1. Carefully examine the applicability of the assessment system in a wide variety of teaching contexts, particularly at the junior high and high school levels, but at the lower levels as well. Engage in additional pilot testing to determine whether there are problems that arise that make the assessment system more difficult to use in certain contexts.

Formative Study B2

This study describes how two assessors executed the assessment system tasks of taking and coding notes, selecting evidence from notes to include on the Record-of-Evidence form, and analyzing and weighing that evidence to arrive at a final rating for each of the criteria. The descriptions give rise to four tentative hypotheses about important similarities and differences in how assessors process information when using a high-inference assessment system and how differences in approach can affect the ratings assessors give. The hypotheses are:

1. Assessors differ in the ways they collect evidence during the observation. Some assessors try to write down everything that happens in the classroom (Assessor 1), whereas others only write down evidence to support the criteria (Assessor 2). The latter are more apt to test hypotheses as they observe (e.g., Assessor 2's questions about equity issues in the classroom).
2. Assessors differ in the types of interpretations they make when they code their notes. If assessors have explicitly used the criteria to focus their note taking, then they have already passed the evidence through a decision filter, and the coding task becomes more one of *remembering* which notes were taken to represent certain criteria than of actually *deciding* which, if any, criteria the notes illustrate (see Assessor 2's description of how she codes her notes). If assessors have tried to stay away from using the criteria to focus their note taking, then during the coding

process, they must first *decide* which notes exemplify a criterion and then *label* it as such (see the description of Assessor 1's coding of notes).

3. Assessors differ in the extent to which they use their coded notes on the Record-of-Evidence form. Some assessors may feel compelled to include *all their notes* on the Record-of-Evidence form; this will likely be the case for assessors who have used the criteria to guide their note taking (Assessor 2). Others may *select* notes that best represent their understanding of the criterion (Assessor 1).
4. Assessors differ according to the extent to which they have special understanding of students, subject matter, school context, etc. These differences may cause the assessor to attend to certain features of the classroom (e.g., Assessor 2's focus on students' attention span) and give lenient or harsh ratings. If assessors do *not* come into an observation with special understanding, they are likely to create that knowledge out of the observation. For example, some assessors may make decisions about the accuracy of the content based on their ability to follow the teacher's lesson. If the teacher makes sense in what he or she says or does regarding the content, then the assessor may judge the content to be accurate. Or if an assessor lacks knowledge of special education students and is observing a special education teacher, the assessor may see those students as the "norm" and judge the teacher accordingly (Assessor 1). Assessors who lack specialized knowledge may rate more leniently than assessors with specialized knowledge. However, assessors who come into an observation with special knowledge are likely to bring a "norming" frame with them (Assessor 2). This frame, inductively generated from prior experience, will cause them to match what they observe against what they know and possibly lead them to rate more stringently.

Based on the findings from Formative Study B2, the following recommendations were offered to improve the assessment process, especially the training of assessors:

1. Provide assessors with a "crib" sheet that displays methods others use to take notes (e.g., abbreviations, how to capture anecdotes, how to keep track of time, how to designate inferences).
2. Discuss with assessors ways of capturing subtle observations (i.e., the observations that are hard to capture in words, such as a teacher's tone of voice or a student's facial expression).
3. Provide observation note sheets with lines down the middle for those who want to separate types of notes they take (e.g., quotations from actions) and observation note sheets that have no lines down the middle for those who want to take running notes across the page.
4. Discuss with assessors how to capture "negative" evidence, or the absence of evidence (e.g., no eye contact for long periods of time).
5. Clarify criteria that overlap (e.g., A1/B1; A1/B3; B4/C4; B6/B7; C4/C5; D1/B4).
6. Determine the best use for the Additional Comments section of the Record-of-Evidence form. What should be placed in this section? General impressions? Inferences? Summaries? Additional evidence for a criterion? Should evidence placed in this section be used to determine ratings?
7. Create more opportunities to gather information for criteria that are presently difficult to document (e.g., A1, D1). This may entail redesigning the pre- and postobservation interviews to ask more pointed questions and/or to standardize probes.
8. Discuss with assessors ways to decide how much evidence is enough to include for a particular criterion. Some criteria appear to generate more evidence than others (e.g., C1 vs. A1).
9. Make sure that all assessors understand the differences between scores of 1 and scores of 2 on the rating scale.

Formative Study B3

In this study, assessors evaluated their own assessment documentation (i.e., classroom observation notes, interview notes, Record-of-Evidence forms). The purpose of the study was to identify and examine differences across assessors in the perceived quality of their documentation.

Assessors' evaluations of their classroom observation and interview notes. When assessors evaluated their classroom observation notes, they found that they had captured much teacher talk, teacher action/behavior, and teacher/student interaction in their notes. By contrast, they had not captured as much student talk, student action/behavior, student/student interaction, and narrative description. This finding suggests that assessors need to be encouraged to strike a balance in their notes, focusing their attention periodically away from the teacher to take note of other important aspects of life in the classroom that they might be missing, particularly those aspects that would provide important evidence for the criteria that are included in our assessment system. Perhaps we could provide new assessors with samples of exemplary observation notes that appear to successfully strike such a balance for them to study as models. They could be encouraged to practice their note taking with the goal of increasing the variety of aspects to which they attend.

Assessors used a 5-point scale to describe the extent to which they could get a sense of the flow of activities that took place in the classroom when they read through their notes. A 1 on the scale was defined as "The notes lack a sense of the flow of activities," while a 5 was defined as "The notes provide a clear sense of the flow of activities." For *classroom observation notes*, the mean rating for the 36 assessors was 3.9 (s.d. 0.5). For the *interview notes*, the mean rating was also 3.9 (s.d. 0.7). We could provide examples of notes that provide a good sense of flow so that new assessors would have some exemplary models to guide them in their first attempts to take notes. We could also encourage new assessors to engage in sustained practice taking notes and evaluating their notes so that they

can become aware of where gaps occur and can develop their own strategies for keeping up with the flow of activities.

Assessors were asked whether they could come back to their notes in a year and reconstruct what happened in the observation. Twenty one assessors (58%) responded that they could reconstruct what happened, while fifteen assessors (42%) felt that they could possibly reconstruct what happened. If we are to deal effectively with this problem, we will need to find out why assessors have reservations about their ability to reconstruct a lesson from their notes, and then we will need to determine whether there are strategies we might introduce in training that would help these assessors.

Assessors reviewed their notes to determine whether any of the statements could be construed as judgments or inferences rather than statements of what occurred in the classroom. Fourteen assessors (39%) felt that their *classroom observation notes* contained no such statements, eleven assessors (31%) felt that their notes might possibly contain such statements, and eleven assessors (39%) felt that their notes did contain such statements. Thirty-one assessors (86%) felt that their *interview notes* contained no such statements, four assessors (11%) felt that their notes might possibly contain such statements, and one assessor (3%) felt that his or her notes did contain such statements. Time could be spent in assessor training discussing how judgments and inferences differ from statements of what was actually said or occurred and why it is important to distinguish between the two. Assessors need to understand the importance of supporting their ratings with direct evidence. We could gather examples of inferences from assessors' notes and use them in devising training exercises that would give assessors practice in learning to distinguish between inferences and direct evidence.

The assessors used a 5-point scale to indicate how comprehensive they felt their observation notes were. A 1 on the scale was defined as "My notes are very incomplete; there were many important activities that provided evidence of criteria that I did not get in my notes," while a 5 was defined as "My notes provide very detailed and comprehensive

coverage of what occurred in the classroom relative to the criteria." The mean rating was 3.5 (s.d. 0.8). During assessor training, we could provide new assessors with examples of notes that are detailed and comprehensive so that the assessors would have some exemplary models to emulate.

Assessors encountered a number of problems when taking notes during the observations and during the interviews. The problems that occurred most frequently *during classroom observing* included having difficulty hearing all that was taking place, needing to use more shorthand/abbreviations, having difficulty observing and writing at the same time, and having difficulty observing teacher and students at the same time. Problems that occurred most frequently *during the conduct of interviews* included having difficulty eliciting enough information from the candidate, having difficulty remaining attentive to the candidate while taking notes, having notes that were uneven in degree of detail, and needing to use more shorthand/abbreviations. Perhaps a segment of the assessor training program could be devoted to acquainting assessors trainees with problems they are likely to encounter when taking notes during classroom observations and interviews. Practical strategies for handling such problems could be presented. Assessors could then practice taking notes so that they can become adept at using the strategies they have been taught. Assessors would also benefit from practice in conducting interviews and in critiquing others as they conduct interviews.

Assessors' evaluations of their Record-of-Evidence forms. Assessors were asked whether they could trace each piece of evidence included on the Record-of-Evidence form back to a documentation source. Only a few criteria were problematic: A1 (Demonstrating application of content knowledge through accurate instruction), B7 (Using instructional time effectively), and C2 (Making the physical environment as conductive to learning as possible). In each case, five to eight assessors experienced problems tracing evidence to its source. However, for most criteria, most assessors felt they could trace each piece of evidence back to a documentation source. Assessors included examples of specific

behaviors, events, interactions, quotes, etc., for nearly all the criteria; but nine assessors (25%) had problems with criterion C2 (Making the physical environment as conductive to learning as possible), and six assessors (17%) did not include examples of specific behaviors, events, and interactions for criterion A1 (Demonstrating application of content knowledge through accurate instruction). Assessor training should emphasize the importance of these two activities--citing specific behaviors, events, interactions, quotes, etc., for each criterion; and tracing each piece of evidence assessors place on a Record-of-Evidence form to a documentation source. Assessors need to understand that these activities are necessary in order to justify a given rating.

Assessors used only one documentation source to provide evidence for a number of criteria. At least 18 assessors (50%) indicated that they used only one documentation source to cite evidence for criteria B3, B6, C4, C5, D1, D2, D4, and D5. This finding would seem to lend support to the need for developing a list of documentation sources for each criterion. Assessors could review the list as they complete their Record-of-Evidence form to help ensure that they do not overlook sources which are likely to include evidence for that criterion.

In a number of cases, assessors had evidence from multiple documentation sources for a given criterion ; but when they wrote up the record of evidence, they cited evidence from only one source because that source provided the most compelling evidence in support of the rating. This is a critical issue that we will need to consider in some detail so that we can develop guidelines to share with assessor trainees. How important is it to have corroborating evidence from multiple and varied documentation sources when building a justification for a rating? Should one include less compelling pieces of evidence from varied documentation sources in the interest of triangulating data, or does one build a stronger justification for a rating by selecting the most potent pieces of evidence, even though they may all be from a single documentation source? We will need to grapple with these questions so that we can devise useful guidelines for assessors to turn to when they

are faced with the task of selecting evidence for a criterion from multiple documentation sources.

Formative Study B4

This study involved an analysis of assessor pair discussions. The purpose of this study was to document both the processes assessors used and the problems they encountered in observing, taking notes, coding notes, and selecting pieces of evidence for the Record-of-Evidence form.

Observing and note taking processes. Although virtually no assessors claimed to keep all 21 criteria in mind during the observation, it was clear that a thorough knowledge of the criteria was important in focusing the observation and in taking notes

In general, assessors reported that they developed fairly idiosyncratic abbreviation systems as they took notes during the observation and the interviews. It is questionable if these observation notes could be interpreted by another person who was not present during the observation. Some assessors stated quite openly that they felt that no one else could read their notes, while others felt confident that their notes were legible and coherent.

Some major concerns were reported regarding simultaneous writing and observing during note taking. Assessors who felt the need to take down every word were also aware of the fact that they might be missing important nonverbal interactions. These nonverbal interactions may be sources of evidence that are as compelling as verbal quotes.

In several situations, the assessors complained that their seating locations limited their ability to see or to hear teacher and/or student interactions. The appropriateness of allowing assessors to move about the classroom was a question for some assessors. One pair of assessors followed a teacher around the gymnasium floor in order to be able to hear teacher and student talk.

The coding process. Assessors used variations of two basic approaches when putting codes on their forms: (a) coding line by line of the notes, e.g., interview notes and

classroom observation notes, or (b) coding by criterion. For example, an assessor looked for all evidence that pertains to criterion A1 in each of the documentation sources. Although some assessors reported that some methods of coding their evidence felt more comfortable for them than other methods, it is unclear if the method was actually making a difference or if the level of experience makes a difference in the assessors' accuracy, efficiency , and comfort level.

Experienced assessors noted that the amount of time it took them to code greatly decreased from the amount of time it took them previously. The more experienced assessors noted that certain criteria seemed to "jump out" at them as they read through their notes.

Nineteen assessors stated that they coded everything in their notes. It is unclear from the discussion, however, if "everything" refers to everything in each of the documentation sources or in the classroom observations exclusively. *When* the assessor chose to select evidence to be used on the Record-of-Evidence form greatly influenced *how much* of the evidence was coded. Those assessors who selected evidence for their Record-of-Evidence form simultaneously as they coded, indicated they did not code all of their notes. Those assessors who kept the coding and selection processes separate, however, tended to code all of their notes.

Twelve of the assessors noted that, at times, they assigned multiple codes to one piece of evidence. Usually when multiple coding of one piece of evidence occurred, it was unclear how the criteria were distinct from one another. Five assessors indicated that some pieces of evidence did not really fit into any of the criteria; yet, they felt the evidence was an important indication of the quality of the teaching they observed.

The selection process. Most of the assessors indicated that they went through all of their sources looking for evidence for each criterion. One quarter of the assessors indicated that they first wrote a thesis statement at the beginning of each criterion section of the

Record-of-Evidence form before transferring evidence onto the record. Some assessors noted that they scored the criteria simultaneously as they selected evidence for the criteria.

Six assessors indicated that they used or thought about using inference when writing up the statements in the Record-of-Evidence form, but they were uncertain if it was permissible to use inference. It was also unclear to assessors if they were allowed to use the same evidence for multiple criteria.

Assessors also intimated that they were unclear about how to weigh evidence. One assessor had the notion that the more evidence one has, the higher the score she may give. Some assessors took the strategy of using as many examples as possible; others selected what they thought was the most compelling evidence. Two assessors mentioned in their discussions that they were unsure of the number of negative pieces of evidence that were "enough" to warrant a low score.

Formative Study B5

This study involved an analysis of small- and large-group discussions among assessors. The purpose of the study was to gather information from assessors about the kinds of problems they encountered in evaluating the candidate, how they handled those problems when they occurred, and their suggestions for improving the assessment process.

Note taking. Assessors had difficulty simultaneously taking notes and establishing rapport (e.g., maintaining eye contact) with the candidate during the interviews. Assessors also had difficulty knowing how closely to follow the scripted interview guides and how to generate and use probes. Sometimes, if the candidate talked a lot for each question and/or answered a number of questions all at once, the assessors found it hard to determine if the candidate had answered the question. In these instances, assessors found themselves unable to probe successfully for more in-depth information.

Assessors also had trouble capturing what went on in the classroom (e.g., student-teacher talk, transitions, equity data); this resulted from many factors, such as: where the

assessor was sitting in the classroom; the candidate's rapid movement between explaining content and managing discipline problems; and students working in groups or in areas not physically close to the assessor (e.g., in the science lab).

Assessors generated a number of suggestions for improving note taking during the pre- and postobservation interviews and the observation: (1) tape record the interviews to use as part of the candidate's file and/or to help the assessor reconstruct what the candidate said and did during the interview, (2) provide training on how to inform the candidate about what to expect during the interview, (3) revise the interview guides to make them more explicit, (4) encourage assessors to ask the candidate the best place to sit in order to capture student-teacher and student-student interactions, and (5) give assessors physical aids to help their note taking.

Coding notes. Assessors found a number of problems with the wording and meaning of individual criteria. These problems made it difficult for assessors to code their notes. Assessors also found they had collected some evidence for which there appeared to be no coding categories. To improve the coding process, assessors suggested the following: (1) clarify what is meant by terminology in the criteria (e.g., community, efficient/effective, routines, appropriate/accurate); (2) combine/separate criteria based on the clarifications; (3) in the training sessions, give assessors visual and written examples of each of the criteria; and (4) provide guidelines for coding evidence not readily subsumed under specific criteria (e.g., inaccuracies in teachers' grammar, teachers' affective states, teachers' professional activities outside the school day).

Selecting evidence for the Record-of-Evidence form. Some assessors had difficulty knowing how much evidence was enough and how much was too little. Another problem with selecting pieces of evidence for the Record-of-Evidence form was trying to figure out what to do if the candidate failed to do something that was expected, that is, there was an absence of evidence for a criterion. Assessors also had questions about how much of their written comments should be evidence and how much should be their own judgment.

Furthermore, assessors had problems seeing the logic train from notes to Record-of-Evidence form to rating. Assessors used different methods to reconcile conflicting pieces of evidence: Some felt the negative evidence "jumps out at you"; others let the most compelling (i.e., the strongest), whether positive or negative, outweigh the other evidence. There was little discussion regarding how assessors actually made these decisions.

To rectify problems assessors experienced in selecting evidence for the Record-of-Evidence form, assessors suggested the following: (1) create exemplars for the Record-of-Evidence form used in training; (2) provide assessors feedback during training regarding the quality of their notes, their selection of evidence for the Record-of-Evidence form, and their choice of rating for the evidence; and (3) in training, discuss ways in which assessors might recognize and reconcile conflicting pieces of evidence.

Using specialized knowledge to weigh evidence and rate the candidate. A critical area for consideration is that of how assessors should use their knowledge of contextual elements, especially subject matter and teaching methods/styles, in making assessments. The comments that arose during the discussion of this issue make it clear that the assessors came to the assessment situation with different understandings of students, subject matter, pedagogy, and school setting. Assessors used these understandings in different ways to arrive at ratings of the candidates. While the performance assessment system makes an effort to balance individual assessors' specialized knowledge by employing multiple assessors and more than one observation of each candidate, there are additional ways that the system might guard against bias and randomness.

To insure that specialized knowledge of the *school and community* is part of the assessor's knowledge base, assessors recommended the following steps be taken: (1) make experiences in a variety of contexts part of training, (2) emphasize confronting biases and expectations, (3) have the candidate create a "most serious" to "least serious" scale of behaviors to expect in the classroom so that the assessor has a frame of reference for observing, (4) choose only assessors who seem likely to benefit from training in cultural

awareness, (5) use role playing during training to practice the pre- and postobservation interviews in order to screen for biases, and (6) increase the length of the training program and/or bring assessors back for an additional training session after the initial one.

Assessors offered these recommendations for improving the assessor training program to insure that assessors are aware of a variety of *teaching methods/styles*: During training, ask assessors to describe their exposure to different teaching styles and then rate their comfort level with observing someone using each style. Provide tapes that exemplify different teaching methods, and have assessors rate and discuss those methods.

Assessors in the small- and large-group meetings had opposing views regarding the need for *subject matter* as part of the assessor's background arsenal. Some argued that the pool of assessors should include both generalist and subject matter specialists, while others felt that assessors should evaluate only teachers who teach in their subject matter and grade level.

Regarding specialized knowledge of *students*, assessors felt that improvements could be made in the assessor training program. Specifically: add more opportunities for assessors to acknowledge the limitations of their own experiences and how these experiences may shape the way they interpret student talk and actions in various classrooms; and provide more training through videotapes or actual experiences with students for assessors to learn about students with different backgrounds and developmental levels.

Scoring the criteria. Two criteria in particular gave assessors problems with scoring in Domain A: A1 (Demonstrating application of content knowledge through accurate instruction) and A3 (Creating or selecting appropriate instructional materials/resources and learning activities that are clearly linked to the goals or intents of the lesson). All the criteria in Domain B were problematic for one reason or another. In Domain C, assessors had comments only about criterion C2 (Making the physical environment as conducive to learning as possible). The problems with scoring criteria in

Domain D (Teacher Professionalism) were centered around criterion definitions being different from the scoring criteria (e.g., D5), and the source of the data for the ratings.

Two major recommendations emerged from the group discussions: (1) scoring rules should be consistent with the criterion definitions; and (2) domain descriptors should be similar in length, depth, and breadth across criteria.

Using the rating scale. All assessors shared the opinion that assessor training should provide examples of what competent beginning teaching looks like along each of the scale points, whichever scale is used (3-point, 5-point, 6-point). Assessors also proposed that for licensing decisions, only two scales are needed: (a) pass/fail or (b) pass, pass with distinction, and fail; however, for professional development, a more finely grained scale is needed (e.g., a 6-point scale where the scale points are defined and illustrated during training).

Formative Study B6

For this study, two researchers at ETS examined the 36 Record-of-Evidence forms completed by assessors in the three pilot tests. Both researchers had participated in an assessor training program at ETS; one had been an assessor in the Minnesota pilots. The purpose of the study was to determine whether assessors differed in the evidence they cited in the Record-of-Evidence forms and whether records of evidence differed in their effectiveness as assessment documents.

Together the researchers devised a matrix and coding scheme that allowed them to get an overview of differences in the nature and quality of evidence cited. The matrix was organized around features of the records of evidence corresponding to the research questions to be addressed: the specificity of evidence cited, the relevance of evidence to the criterion for which it was cited, the use of evidence from multiple documentation sources, the support for the rating provided by the evidence, and the similarity of evidence cited by the two assessors in the assessor pair.

Using this matrix and working independently, each researcher coded the entire set of 36 records of evidence and identified practices affecting the quality of the records of evidence as assessment documents. The researchers then compared and discussed their independent observations, which became the basis for a qualitative analysis.

The evaluation of records of evidence within the pairs and across the group of assessors provided a perspective on the assessors' role and on the function of the Record-of-Evidence forms that was not previously apparent. It became clear that in the most convincing records of evidence the assessor acted as a professional exercising informed judgment about the performance of another professional and that the assessor's comments in effect put forward an argument in support of the rating.

In addition, the comparisons among assessors' comments in support of their judgments suggested that some approaches to generating comments were more effective than others. The qualitative analysis indicated six issues were related to assessors' effectiveness in using the Record-of-Evidence forms and warranted consideration in subsequent Praxis III development. For each issue, questions were provided to inform discussion and shape further development. Recommendations were also provided to guide assessor practice; these were expressed as advice that could be given to assessors, as follows:

Relationship of comments to rating

1. Consider the comments to be an argument supporting the rating.
2. Use generalizations firmly grounded in evidence to shape the comments as necessary.
3. Provide an underlined overall statement summarizing the comments and explicitly linking them by way of the scoring rule with the criterion and the rating.

Interpretation versus citing specific behaviors

1. Provide interpretation or generalization as needed to indicate what conclusions are to be drawn from the evidence.
2. Cite specific behaviors or events to support all interpretations or generalizations.
3. Where evidence is abundant, select events to support all interpretations or generalizations.
4. Provide sufficient detail so that the comments can stand alone without reference to other documents.
5. Describe events succinctly but in sufficient detail to convey the central point as efficiently and effectively as possible.

Handling of negative evidence

1. Consider all evidence relevant to the criterion, positive and negative, and assign a tentative rating based on the overall relationship of the evidence to the scoring rules: identify the pieces of evidence, positive and negative, that best support the rating and include them in your comments, with a summary statement that takes them into account; review comments and summary statement and make a final decision about the rating. (By negative evidence, we mean evidence that goes against the expectations built into a criterion. The candidate says or does something that the assessor would perceive as a weakness in the candidate's performance.)
2. Select negative evidence for inclusion in your comments if it influenced your rating, recording it near the end of the comments.
3. Indicate the relative importance of positive and negative evidence in relation to the rating, preferably through reference to the scoring rules.

Insufficient evidence and lack of evidence

1. While conducting postobservation interviews, probe for evidence relevant to criteria for which you have as yet little or no evidence.
2. As far as possible for each criterion, either provide relevant evidence or identify instances in which you would expect to find evidence but did not.
3. If your comments include both relevant evidence and indications of a lack of expected evidence, indicate the relative importance of each in relation to the scoring rules and assigned rating.

Advantages of subject-matter knowledge and classroom experience

1. Draw on your knowledge of relevant subject matter and subject-matter pedagogy, as well as your classroom experience with students, especially those in the age group observed, to indicate the significance of specific behaviors cited or of the lack of evidence for expected behaviors.
2. Use terminology specific to the subject matter where it is necessary to describe specific behaviors and events or to indicate their implications.

The qualitative analysis of the completed Record-of-Evidence forms also suggested that a number of procedures be incorporated into the preparation of assessors:

1. Describe the assessor's role as that of a professional exercising judgment about the performance of another professional.
2. Describe the preparation of assessors as a series of experiences designed to help teachers refine their professional judgment so they can be fair in making judgments about the performance of other teachers and articulate in supporting those judgments.

3. Establish a shared understanding of the relationship between comments and rating on the Record-of-Evidence form and of the features in comments that enhance their value as support for the ratings.
4. Use an exercise analogous to the standard setting in scoring sessions for essay examinations to establish shared expectations for comments and a shared sense of standards for ratings.
5. Provide individual feedback to participants on their record of evidence ratings and comments.

Formative Study C

One goal of this study was to examine the extent to which the various Praxis III instruments enable assessors to collect information on candidate's competence in addressing diversity in their teaching. A second goal was to determine the training program's effectiveness in preparing assessors to deal with issues of diversity in the assessment process.

Several sources of data were analyzed in this study. In one of the analysis activities, as described in the methodology section of this report, the assessors were asked to highlight with a magic marker all the evidence related to cultural diversity in their data. In total, 20 full sets of instruments and Record-of-Evidence forms were used in this portion of the analysis. A questionnaire completed by each assessor pair provided the second source of data. This questionnaire asked assessors to identify all the questions on each instrument that generated data on cultural diversity. To qualify for inclusion, both assessors in the pair had to agree on a question's relevance to diversity. A third source of data for this study consisted of notes taken during three group discussions with the assessors (one after each of the three rounds of data collection). These discussions centered around various cultural diversity themes. The major findings are reported below.

Definition of cultural diversity. During the initial round of data collection, it became clear that Praxis III lacked a clear definition of the term "cultural diversity." Two definitions surfaced during group discussions. One definition equated diversity with ethnic differences, while the other equated it with differences associated with language groups, socioeconomic background, gender, and exceptionality, as well as ethnicity. After lengthy discussions, the research team recommended that Praxis III adopt the broader definition of diversity. It was argued that the broad definition gives proper attention to ethnic differences while at the same time drawing needed attention to the manner in which candidates treat other important student characteristics (gender, membership in language groups other than English, socioeconomic backgrounds, and exceptionalities) in their teaching.

Teaching criteria and scoring rules. A question that was debated throughout the development of Praxis III is whether to infuse cultural diversity throughout the various teaching criteria, or to treat diversity separately as a subset of the criteria. Supporters of the infusion approach argued that diversity affects every aspect of teaching and learning, and as such it cannot be artificially localized into a few criteria. Those who prefer treating diversity as a separate subset of the criteria argued that this approach makes it easier to train assessors to look for evidence of diversity and to use it in judging candidates' performance.

A review of the performance criteria that were used during the field tests (see Appendix A) shows that ETS attempted to strike a balance between the two approaches to diversity mentioned above. Three criteria (B1, B2, and C4) deal explicitly with diversity. Nevertheless, most of the other criteria address diversity, although the theme is dealt with only implicitly (B3, B4, B5, B6, B7, C1, C2, C3, C5, D3, D5).

Underlying the Praxis III criteria is a concern that teachers *treat students from different cultural groups equitably*. Such equitable treatment is evident in how the instructor makes content comprehensible, monitors understanding, provides feedback, adjusts learning, makes expectations clear, encourages the extension of thinking, uses

instructional time, helps students understand classroom rules and routines, maintains rapport, accepts responsibility for student learning, and communicates with parents.

A second diversity theme underlying the Praxis III criteria is that to be successful, teachers must build new learning on students' background knowledge and experiences, including their cultural resources. These individual and cultural resources must be identified by the teacher, must be viewed by him or her as strengths, and must be used in the teaching process. This concern for building bridges between what is already familiar to the students and the content and methods of instruction is evident in criteria B1 and B2, but implied in the other criteria as well.

While the criteria used in these field tests were originally designed to underscore the importance of diversity in teaching and learning, the practice proved otherwise. The Record-of-Evidence forms completed by the assessor as part of the formative studies contained few statements about diversity, other than a handful of comments related to criteria B1, B2, and C4, and to a lesser extent criterion C5. That is, in supporting their ratings, assessors gave little consideration to diversity for those criteria that were are not explicit on this matter. If attention to diversity was given, it is certainly not evident from the completed Record-of-Evidence forms. This was a disturbing finding.

Based on this finding, the research team recommended that assessors be helped to understand the role that diversity plays in the criteria. Without a doubt, the training program needed to be strengthened to help assessors view diversity as an integrated aspect of each criterion. However, issues of diversity needed to be made clearer in criterion definitions and corresponding scoring rules as well.

Instruments. The set of instruments used in the initial round of data collection in Minnesota and Delaware (see Appendix G) proved inadequate for collecting data regarding candidates' ability to teach students of diverse backgrounds. Part of the problem with the original set of instruments stemmed from a lack of clarity regarding the meaning of diversity. In the absence of a clear definition, the instruments were vague at best. For

example, question 7 of the Preobservation Interview asked the candidate to explain how planned instruction builds on "individual and group differences." The meaning of "group differences" was left vague. Question 8 in the same instrument asked the candidate to explain how he or she learns about "students' backgrounds." While a parenthetical comment provides examples, the question was too open to elicit useful information. The tentativeness with which issues of diversity were explored in conversations with candidates was also evident in questions 3, 4, and 5 of the Preobservation Interview.

A number of instrument changes were suggested in order to address the problems discussed above. The proposed revisions were focused primarily on the Class Profile and the Preobservation Interview, the two instruments the assessors found most conducive to collecting data on cultural diversity.

Assessor training. The research team concluded that it was impossible to determine the efficacy of the assessor training program in dealing with issues of diversity on the basis of these data. The success of any training program depends on the quality of the system it is preparing participants to implement (in this case, the criteria, scoring rules, and instruments). The absence of a clear definition of diversity, the indirect manner of dealing with diversity in the teaching criteria, and the vague questions used in the Class Profile and Preobservation Interview made it virtually impossible to train in this area, according to assessors.

The research team expressed confidence, however, that the proposed revisions in the criteria and data-collection instruments would give assessors more guidance in dealing with matters of diversity. Additionally, fundamental changes in the training program regarding diversity were recommended. These recommendations included the following:

1. Infuse discussions of diversity throughout the training program; do not keep it as a separate component.
2. Provide a clear definition of diversity, as the concept is used in Praxis III. Reinforce this definition as much as possible throughout the training. Also, give

attention to the term "cultural resources." As used in Praxis III, this refers to the various experiences students have had as members of different groups in our society.

3. Give attention to the conception of teaching and learning that guided the development of Praxis III. Explain how this constructivist view demands that teachers build their lessons on what is already familiar to students, including their cultural resources.
4. As each performance domain is introduced, discuss the role diversity plays in the various criteria.
5. When training assessors to use interview data in rating candidates, illustrate with examples that deal with diversity.
6. Model how to score criteria from a cultural perspective (e.g., making content comprehensible to students).

## III. Using the Findings to Improve Praxis III

This section discusses how the findings from this set of formative studies were used to improve various aspects of Praxis III. Specifically, attention is given to changes made in criteria descriptions and accompanying scoring rules, data-collection instruments, procedural guidelines, and the assessor training program. The discussion is divided into three sections, one for each set of studies described in this report.

When considering the implications of findings from these studies for improving Praxis III, one must keep in mind the limitations of the sample of assessors, candidates, and classes we studied. We set out to examine intensively the problems that arise in one's first attempts to implement the classroom performance assessment system. While there was some diversity among assessors, candidates, and classes, the samples were by no means random samples of individuals who would use the performance assessments. In studying only 18 candidates, 36 assessors, and 18 classrooms, we were not able to sample from all important segments of the population. The omission of certain segments may have had an effect on the studies' results. These studies will therefore need to be followed up by large-scale research efforts that carefully examine the impact of the classroom performance assessments on various segments of the population. However, although the samples for the formative studies were small and non-random, these research efforts helped us pinpoint a number of problems that we need to consider as we attempt to improve the assessment system.

### Formative Study A

The various revision recommendations made by the research team on the basis of the study finding were already discussed in a previous section of this report. The development team acted upon the vast majority of these recommendations.

Instrument revision. The development team revised each data-collection instrument based on findings from this investigation (see Appendix H). The original version of the Class Profile and Instruction Profile proved to be somewhat problematic for candidates

who generally lacked a clear understanding of the intent of certain items and the level of specificity expected from the completed forms. As recommended, these instruments were revised to clarify key terms. Problematic items were reworded to make their intent clearer to the candidate. Items believed to be irrelevant to the assessment were eliminated, and other items thought to be more relevant were added.

The pre- and postobservation interviews were revised considerably. These revisions made the interviews more conversational in tone and therefore easier to conduct. Critical probes were put directly on the forms to ensure the completeness of the data. A few format changes were also made. Most notably, the use of bold-face type for key words and phrases facilitated the interview process. The format of the Class Observation Record was also revised to make the form easier for assessors to use.

Assessor training program. A number of revisions were made in the assessor training program in order to address the problems identified through this study. These revisions included (1) being more explicit about how assessors are to use the information found in the Class Profile; and (2) giving more attention to interviewing techniques, especially note taking, use of probes, strategies for keeping candidates focused, and establishing and maintaining rapport with candidates during interviews.

Procedural guidelines. The research team made a few procedural recommendations as well. These included the following: (1) finding a systematic way of making it clear to candidates that they are expected to submit copies of relevant instructional materials and evaluation (whenever possible) with the completed Instruction Profile, (2) giving candidates a model of a completed Class Profile and Instruction Profile to help them understand the level of detail expected in these forms, and (3) providing candidates with a list of interview questions before the two interviews with them to help keep candidates focused during the interview. These procedural recommendations were incorporated into an orientation session for candidates during which they are introduced to Praxis III and to what is expected of them in the assessments.

Formative Studies B1-B6

Criteria descriptions and scoring rules. After the formative studies were completed, a committee of ETS staff from Test Development, Research, and Statistical Analysis met to revise domain descriptions, criterion descriptions, and scoring rules. Several staff members prepared a document that summarized the findings from formative studies B1-B6 that pertained to each criterion. The committee used this document to guide their revision efforts. Researchers who conducted the formative studies were invited to committee meetings to share the results of their studies, to make recommendations for revising various aspects of the assessment process, and to have a hand in crafting those revisions.

The process of revising criterion descriptions, domain descriptions, and scoring rules was carried out in an iterative fashion. The first stage occurred soon after the formative studies were completed (i.e., late December 1991 through early January 1992). The next stage took place during August and September 1992. At each stage, committee members came back to the research findings from formative studies B1-B6 and examined them in light of new information they had obtained (i.e., information gathered from interviews with assessors to get their reactions to the various changes made in the assessment system). The committee reviewed the new information and used it to guide their subsequent round of revisions. (See Appendices E and F to compare the criterion descriptions and scoring rules used in the pilot tests against the most recent version of the criterion descriptions and scoring rules.)

In each case, the revision process resulted in the addition of some new criteria to the assessment system and the deletion of others (particularly criteria for which assessors had difficulty finding any evidence). In some cases, criteria that assessors perceived as overlapping were combined into a single criterion. In other cases, the definitions for criteria that seemed to overlap were rewritten to clarify the distinctions between the criteria. In a small number of cases, criteria were moved from one domain to another if assessors felt that conceptually they belonged in another domain. The ordering of criteria within

domains was also changed to improve their logical sequencing. Domain descriptions were revised to help assessors understand the distinctions between the domains. Criterion descriptions were revised and expanded to increase their clarity and to align the descriptions and the scoring rules more closely.

The committee made a number of changes in the scoring rules as a result of reviewing the results from the formative studies. The changes occurred as an evolutionary process over time as more information about assessors' use of the rating scales became available. First, the committee sought to clarify the meaning of the 6-point scale. Some assessors viewed the scale as defining a continuum from novice to expert teacher; others saw the scale as defining a continuum from inadequate to highly competent novice teacher. The committee decided to define the scale in terms of beginning teachers' performance only.

Committee members then drafted a "generic" score scale that defined various levels of beginning teacher competency. This scale was devised to help assessors understand the nature of the judgments they were to make about teacher competence and would be used in subsequent training sessions to orient assessors to the rating process. The generic scale was designed to be independent of the individual criterion scales. The committee members used the generic scale to guide their revisions of the definitions of scale points for individual criteria. As they rewrote an individual score point definition for a specific criterion, committee members referred to the corresponding score point definition on the generic scale and tried to craft a criterion-specific definition that would mirror the generic description. The goal in revising the score point definitions for an individual criterion scale was to help assessors understand how the generic levels of performance might appear "in the flesh" with respect to that criterion. The hope was that the individual criterion scales could be made more comparable (i.e., a 2 on the scale for one criterion would be equivalent to a 2 on the scale for another criterion).

Initially, the rating scale for each criterion ran from 0 to 5. Scale points 0, 2, and 4 were anchored by written descriptions, but the intermediate scale points (i.e., 1, 3, and 5) had no such descriptions. While the 0 point seemed to be important conceptually, assessors seldom used it. Accordingly, the committee decided to keep the idea of a six-point scale, but the rating scale was revised to run from 1 to 3. Scale points 1, 2, and 3 were to be anchored by written descriptions, but intermediate points would be included on the rating scale to accommodate the need assessors expressed to give scores that fall between two defined scale points.

Committee members focused much of their efforts on revising the descriptions of scale points at the low end of the scale for three reasons: (a) assessors seemed to have the most trouble making those critical distinctions, (b) assessors were less confident in the ratings they made at the low end of the scale, and (c) licensure decisions would typically focus on performance at the lower end of the scale. The committee rewrote scale point descriptions to try to differentiate more clearly between unacceptable performance and minimally competent performance with respect to the criterion. In defining minimally competent performance, the committee members sought to describe the performance level in positive terms (i.e., what the teacher demonstrates that he or she is able to do) rather than in negative terms (i.e., what the teacher is not able to do) so that the feedback given to beginning teachers would be more positive.

Assessor training. Formative studies B1-B6 provided valuable insight into the process of making complex judgments that is at the heart of the Praxis III assessment system. Since the program to train assessors is designed to enable participants to make defensible professional judgments, the findings of these formative studies were clearly integral to the development of the training program.

The biggest change to the system as a whole was the revision of criteria and scoring rules. After those revisions were made, the training program was reworked to reflect those changes. This involved revising work sheets, training exercises, and videotapes so that

they would align with the criteria and scoring rules. Other changes in the training program are described below:

1. Sequence of sections of the training program. In the original training design, the domains were presented in the sequence of C, A, B, and D. This was a deliberate design choice that enabled participants to become immediately involved with Domain C, one of the interactive domains of teaching (e.g., the domain which primarily involves the relationships between teachers and their students). The developers of the training program considered this to be the "easier" of the interactive domains and therefore a good one with which to start. The developers believed that participants would have early success in the training program and would therefore be less likely to become overwhelmed by the details of an assessment.

During the pilot testing, however, it became clear that many participants did, indeed, become overwhelmed by the details. The initial training design had not, it appeared, provided an adequate sense of the entire assessment process, so participants were learning the details of performance on a certain criterion before they had a solid grasp of the more general principles. Therefore, when revising the training program, the developers initiated many changes. First, they rearranged the major sections of the training program so they more closely reflected the actual assessment process itself. They devoted considerable time at the outset to the sequence of events of an assessment (e.g., the setting up of appointments, the sequence in which forms are filled out, and by whom they are filled out). Additionally, they revised the sections of the training program to more closely reflect the sequence of an actual assessment. Thus, assessor trainees begin with evaluating written documents (the Class Profile and the Instruction Profile) and conducting a preobservation interview. These activities serve as an introduction to assessing a candidate's competence with respect to the criteria contained in Domain A.

2. Learning to take notes and conduct interviews. A number of assessors who took part in the formative studies indicated that they felt they needed more training in how to take notes

and conduct interviews. The revised assessor training program takes a more structured approach to learning these tasks than was evident in earlier versions of the training.

To introduce the topic of note taking, assessors read materials on developing note taking skills. They view a videotape of a classroom situation, practice taking notes on segments of the videotape, and then compare their notes to experts' notes in order to get feedback on the adequacy of their notes. The instructor shares lists of common abbreviations that other assessors have devised and examples of shorthand that have proven helpful. The training program stresses the importance of striking a balance between focusing one's attention on the teacher and observing other important aspects of classroom life (such as student behavior, physical environment of the classroom, etc.) that would provide important evidence for the criteria. Assessors are encouraged to engage in periods of sustained note taking practice in order to improve their skills.

The instructor describes the purpose of conducting the preobservation and postobservations interviews and shows how the information gained in the interviews feeds into the assessment (e.g., which particular criteria typically make use of evidence obtained from the interviews). Assessors read selections about conducting interviews. They view a videotape of an interview and critique the assessor's performance, pointing out aspects of the performance that could be improved. They are led through a focused discussion of characteristics of a good interview. The training program also emphasizes the importance of probing and provides opportunities for assessors to prepare suitable probes for the various questions and to practice those probes in an interview role-play.

3. Training in employing the scoring rules. Through the formative studies, it became clear that assessors needed additional guidance on how to make judgments using the scoring rules. In a number of cases, assessors reported that they did not use the scoring rules or that they referred to them in only a general way when assigning ratings to a candidate . In the revised training program, participants score written records of evidence and write summary statements that link the specific events of the classroom to the language of the

scoring rules. After scoring the sample records of evidence, participants further enhance their skills by summarizing evidence for each of the criteria from videotaped lessons.

4. Training in making professional judgments. The formative studies revealed that assessors experienced a number of difficulties when making judgments about teacher competence with respect to a criterion. Assessors identified a number of aspects of arriving at a judgment that were troublesome (e.g., distinguishing between direct and inferred evidence, weighing positive and negative evidence for a criterion, determining whether they had included enough evidence for a criterion, selecting evidence from multiple documentation sources). To help assessors learn to deal with these problems, the training program breaks the judgment process into its component parts and trains for each part individually. For example, participants analyzing the scoring rules and the critical distinctions between different levels of performance construct examples of performance at each level of the rating scale as they investigate each criterion, identify specific sources of evidence (e.g., actual questions on the interviews, or types of classroom performance), classify written vignettes as to the appropriate criterion, write a summary statement for a certain collection of evidence, watch taped segments and take notes on the events, and lastly, evaluate taped segments as to specific domains and criteria. The instructor then models each of these steps, and assessors discuss how to carry out each step in the process.

5. Providing additional information to the trainees. The original instructor's guide for the training program included a great deal of information as to the background of many of the procedures that people believed would be of benefit to the participants themselves. Later revisions of the training program have incorporated into the participant manual much of the material that was previously available only to the instructor. In addition, the exercises are fully explained in the participant manual, so a participant can later read the manual and recall the actual events of training.

Formative Study C

Definition of diversity. As a result of this study, Praxis III adopted a broad definition of cultural diversity, one that gives attention to ethnicity, gender, social class, and language differences, as well as differences derived from exceptionalities.

Criteria. The criterion descriptions and the questions for assessors to reflect on were revised significantly to give more attention to issues of diversity (see Appendices E and F). The added text is intended to serve as a reminder to assessors that evidence for diversity is to be sought in nearly all criteria.

Instruments. Two instruments, the Class Profile and the Preobservation Interview, were revised substantially to enable assessors to collect the needed data on cultural diversity (see Appendices G and H).

Building on the broad definition of culture, the Class Profile was revised to ensure the systematic collection of data on the relevant dimensions of this diversity (ethnicity in question 5, language group in question 6, gender in questions 2 and 3, economic status in question 7, and exceptionalities in question 11). It should be noted that the questions related to economic status and exceptionalities were revised substantially. A question was also added to the Class Profile asking the candidate to explain any special accommodations that will be made in the lesson for students with exceptionalities.

The more pronounced changes, however, were made in the Preobservation Interview. As revised, several questions now direct the assessor to explore the relationship between the students' background experiences and the instructional materials, activities, and evaluation. Instead of leaving the probes to the discretion of the assessor, the instrument now includes a systematic way of collecting the needed information. Another change in the preobservation interview gives candidates an opportunity to comment on what consideration, if any, they gave specific student characteristics (gender, race/ethnicity, language group, economic status, exceptionalities) in planning the lesson to be observed.

The revised wording is significantly more direct than asking candidates to explain how the instruction plan builds on "group differences."

Assessor training. The research team made a number of recommendations to strengthen the assessor training program in dealing with issues of diversity. These recommendations, which were detailed in a previous section of this report, underscore the importance of infusing attention to diversity throughout the training program. In the assessors' view, such a strategy would serve to model the notion of cultural infusion, which is one of the more innovative features of Praxis III.

## Summary

The overarching goal of the formative studies was to identify strengths of Praxis III as well as aspects that needed further refinement. While many aspects of the performance assessment system seem to work well, we identified a number of problems with the system. Some problems were easily remedied, some continue to require attention, and some are inherent in observation systems.

We initiated changes in Praxis III to eliminate the easily remedied kinds of problems For example, assessors needed certain information to make judgments but did not have the the information available, so we revised the data-collection forms to include questions that would elicit the necessary information from the candidate.

Other problems we identified will require continuing attention. While we made some changes in the assessment system to try to deal effectively with these persistent problems (e.g., we revised individual criterion descriptions and scoring rules), we will need to monitor the system's performance over a period of time to determine whether our efforts were successful or whether the problems continue to exist. If we find that a problem has not been remedied, we will need to experiment with other approaches until we find a practicable solution.

Finally, some of the problems we identified have no ready-made "solutions." These problems may be inherent in observation systems, even in well-crafted observation systems. They occur not only in the context of Praxis III, but also in other teacher assessment systems. For example, assessors are likely to experience the problem of conflicting evidence that is difficult to reconcile, no matter how finely tuned the assessment system. Assessors for Praxis III may continue to encounter these kinds of problems even after we have initiated improvements in other aspects of the assessment system. While we cannot eliminate these pervasive problems, we can provide assessors with some guidance on confronting these problems when they do occur. When we talk with assessors about how they work through these problems, we may learn about effective strategies they have devised that we could then incorporate into the assessor training program. As we share findings of our formative evaluation with developers of other teacher assessment systems, we may learn about strategies they are exploring to work with the kinds of problems that we have identified as common to our observation systems.

ETS maintains an ongoing commitment to the development of Praxis III. While we have learned much from our initial pilot tests of the assessment system in Delaware and Minnesota, we acknowledge that we still have much to learn. We look forward to working cooperatively with additional states during the next development phase as we direct our efforts to further refinement of the Praxis III performance assessment system.

## References

Camp, R., & Mandinach, E. (1993). *Formative studies of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Issues identified in qualitative analysis of record-of-evidence forms. (Formative Study B6).* (Research Memorandum No. 94-6). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Dwyer, C. A., & Villegas, A. M. (1992). *Guiding conceptions and assessment principles for The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Morris, L. V., & Jones, J. (1993). *Formative studies of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Comparisons of assessor approaches to the observing, note taking, coding, and selecting processes. (Formative Study B4).* (Research Memorandum No. 94-4). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Myford, C. M., & Lehman, P. (1993a). *Formative studies of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Questionnaire results. (Formative Study B1).* (Research Memorandum No. 94-1). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Myford, C. M., & Lehman, P. (1993b). *Formative studies of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Assessors' evaluation of their own classroom observation notes, interview notes, and record-of-evidence forms. (Formative Study B3).* (Research Memorandum No. 94-3). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Reynolds, A. (1993a). *Formative studies of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Not all assessors are alike: A case study of two assessors. (Formative Study B2).* (Research Memorandum No. 94-2). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Reynolds, A. (1993b). *Formative studies of Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments. Small- and large-group discussions among assessors. (Formative Study B5).* (Research Memorandum No. 94-5). Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Villegas, A. M. (1990). *Culturally responsive pedagogy for the 1990's and beyond.* Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

# Appendix A: Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments Criteria and Domains
(Fall 1991 version)

Domain A: Organizing Content Knowledge for Teaching

Criterion A1: Demonstrating application of content knowledge through accurate instruction
Criterion A2: Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was studied previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be studied in the future
Criterion A3: Creating or selecting appropriate instructional materials/resources and learning activities that are clearly linked to the goals or intents of the lesson
Criterion A4: Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are clearly linked to the goals or intents of the lesson

Domain B: Teaching for Student Learning

Criterion B1: Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultures
Criterion B2: Helping students activate relevant aspects of their prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultural resources in order to promote learning
Criterion B3: Making content comprehensible to students
Criterion B4: Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands
Criterion B5: Setting high expectations for each student, making learning expectations clear to students, and helping students accept responsibility for their own learning
Criterion B6: Encouraging students to extend their own thinking
Criterion B7: Using instructional time effectively

Domain C: Creating an Environment for Student Learning

Criterion C1: Creating a purposeful and well-functioning learning community with convenient and well-understood classroom routines
Criterion C2: Making the physical environment as conducive to learning as possible
Criterion C3: Establishing and consistently maintaining clear standards of behavior
Criterion C4: Creating a climate that ensures equity and respect for and among students, and between students and the teacher
Criterion C5: Establishing and maintaining rapport with students in ways that are appropriate to the students' developmental levels

Domain D: Teacher Professionalism

Criterion D1: Reflecting on the extent to which the instructional goals were met
Criterion D2: Explaining how insights gained from instructional experience can be used subsequently
Criterion D3: Demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for student learning
Criterion D4: Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and coordinate learning activities for students
Criterion D5: Communicating with families regarding student learning and, where appropriate, interacting effectively with the community

# Appendix B: Praxis III: Classroom Performance Assessments Criteria and Domains
(Fall 1992 version)

Domain A: Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning

Criterion A1: Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences
Criterion A2: Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate for the students
Criterion A3: Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future
Criterion A4: Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson
Criterion A5: Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson

Domain B: Creating an Environment for Student Learning

Criterion B1: Creating a climate that promotes fairness
Criterion B2: Establishing and maintaining rapport with students
Criterion B3: Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student
Criterion B4: Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior
Criterion B5: Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible

Domain C: Teaching for Student Learning

Criterion C1: Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students
Criterion C2: Making content comprehensible to students
Criterion C3: Encouraging students to extend their thinking
Criterion C4: Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands
Criterion C5: Using instructional time effectively

Domain D: Teacher Professionalism

Criterion D1: Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met
Criterion D2: Demonstrating a sense of efficacy
Criterion D3: Demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for student learning
Criterion D4: Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students
Criterion D5: Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning

# Appendix C: Description of the Assessor Training Program Used in the Pilot Tests

Day 1. On the first day, the assessors received an overview of the classroom performance assessments. The presentation focused on the need for in-depth training to enable assessors to make defensible professional judgments when using the system. A number of challenges to making credible judgments were discussed. Assessors were introduced to the various types of data collection methodologies that are a part of the assessment system, the domains to be assessed, and the relationships among the domains. On this first day, trainers also introduced Domain C (Creating an Environment for Student Learning). In small groups, the trainees generated positive and negative examples of evidence for Domain C. Each assessor completed a work sheet that required him or her to read a number of statements of evidence and then to indicate how he or she would code each statement using the various criteria included in Domain C. Homework for the first night involved reading a case study and a paper on culturally responsive pedagogy (Villegas, 1990) and taking notes on a TV program as an introduction to note taking.

Day 2. The morning of day two continued the discussion of Domain C and focused on note taking skills. Guidelines for note taking were presented and explained. Assessors practiced taking notes of a videotaped class, coding the notes, completing the Record-of-Evidence form, and applying the scoring rules for the criteria in Domain C. In the afternoon, the discussion turned to Domain B (Teaching for Student Learning). Assessors generated evidence of criteria for Domain B, learned to recognize the criteria in a variety of contexts, and collected evidence from a videotape. Additionally, they completed a work sheet that required them to read a number of statements of evidence and then to indicate how they would code each statement using the various criteria included in Domains B and C. The assessors also engaged in a discussion of culturally responsive pedagogy, focusing on the concept of culture and how it affects what assessors see and what teachers do in the classroom. For homework, assessors were to take notes on a TV program, read a case study on conferencing and code it for Domain B criteria.

Day 3. The discussion of Domain B carried over into the morning of the third day. Assessors read a case study, watched a video of a classroom, coded notes, completed the Record-of-Evidence form, and applied the scoring rules for the criteria in Domain B. They then moved into a discussion of Domain A (Organizing Content Knowledge for Teaching). Assessors studied the primary sources of evidence for these criteria (i.e., the Instruction Profile and the Preobservation Interview form). They reviewed the criteria descriptions and gained familiarity with the scoring rules for criteria in this domain. Working in pairs, the assessors role played a preobservation interview. They used the notes they took to

complete a Record-of-Evidence form for Domain A. Later in the afternoon, the assessors were introduced to Domain D (Teacher Professionalism). Assessors studied the primary source of evidence for these criteria (i.e., Postobservation Interview form). Working in pairs, the assessors determined which questions on the form addressed which criteria in Domain D. The assessor pairs role played a postobservation interview to gain experience in using the interview protocol. The assessors also viewed a videotape of a postobservation interview, took notes, coded the notes, completed a Record-of-Eidence form, and applied the scoring rules for the criteria in Domain D. After these activities were completed, the trainers provided an overview of the field experience component of the training program, which involved acquiring experience in actually observing in classrooms, taking notes, and completing the forms for the assessment process. Homework for day three required reading papers on the types of errors that assessors typically make when using rating scales.

Day 4. Day four began with assessors sharing their field work experiences. The focus of training then turned to conferencing skills. Participants were given guidelines for conducting interviews, and they discussed the "do's and don'ts" of interviewing. Obstacles to objectivity in conducting performance assessments were explained. Assessors learned about the most common instrument errors, such as halo effect, leniency, and central tendency, that can result in systematic bias in performance assessment. Assessors also engaged in a discussion of context-specific pedagogy, highlighting the importance of assessing the extent of the beginning teacher's pedagogical content knowledge. Assessors explored the implications of teaching in different contexts (i.e., grade levels, subject matters, etc.) and discussed why it is important for them to be aware of context effects when they use this assessment system. In the afternoon, assessors prepared for their proficiency test. Homework for the evening was to practice for the proficiency test.

Day 5. On day five, the last day of the training, assessors took a proficiency test in the morning, which involved viewing a videotape of a preobservation interview, a classroom observation, and a postobservation interview. The assessors took notes on the videotape, coded their notes, and then completed a Record-of-Evidence form. In the afternoon, they discussed procedures, forms, and any other questions they had regarding the assessment system.

# Appendix D: Background and Experiences of Assessors and Candidates at Each Site

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Assessor Profile for ET301**<br>Education: bachelor's in math, master's in public service administration and secondary counseling, doctorate in educational research methods<br>Teaching Experience: has taught post-secondary mathematics and counseling/educational psychology<br>Current Position: research associate at ETS | **Assessor Profile for MN204**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education and early childhood education, master's in education<br>Certification: certified to teach nursery, kindergarten, grades 1-6<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects<br>Current Position: teaches reading and math (grades K-3) in a low income, urban area | **Candidate Profile for MN 227**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education<br>Current Position: teaching in low income, urban elementary and middle schools<br>Lesson for Evaluation: kindergarten language arts |
| **Assessor Profile for ET302**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education, master's in psychology<br>Certification: certified to teach elementary K-8, gifted education K-12<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects, gifted education K-12, language arts, and social sciences<br>Current Position: associate examiner at ETS | **Assessor Profile for MN202**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education and Spanish<br>Certification: certified to teach grades 1-6<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects<br>Current Position: is lead mentor in an urban school system | **Candidate Profile for MN222**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education<br>Current Position: teaching grades 5 and 6 in a low income, urban elementary school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grades 5-6 geography |
| **Assessor Profile for ET300**<br>Education: bachelor's and master's in English<br>Teaching Experience: has taught college-level language arts/communication<br>Current Position: development scientist at ETS | **Assessor Profile for MN203**<br>Education: bachelor's in English and sociology, master's in educational administration at secondary level<br>Certification: certified to teach social studies, sociology, language arts<br>Teaching Experience: has taught language arts and social sciences<br>Current Position: teaches language arts in a high school in a low income, urban area | **Candidate Profile for MN229**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education<br>Current Position: teaching grade 6 in a low income, urban middle school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 6 science |
| **Assessor Profile for ET304**<br>Education: bachelor's in philosophy, master's in urban education, doctorate in sociology of education<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects in grades 2-5, has college teaching experience<br>Current Position: research scientist at ETS | **Assessor Profile for MN214**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education and history, master's in elementary education<br>Certification: certified to teach grades 1-6<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary and middle school subjects, has college teaching and staff development experience<br>Current Position: staff development director and mentor director in a suburban school system | **Candidate Profile for MN224**<br>Education: bachelor's in education<br>Current Position: teaching grade 6 in an urban middle school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 6 reading/language arts |
| **Assessor Profile for ET305**<br>Education: bachelor's in art education, master's of fine arts in painting, doctorate in art history/studio art<br>Certification: certified to teach studio art and art history at the high school level<br>Teaching Experience: has taught visual art, art history, and interdisciplinary studies at the high school level<br>Current Position: examiner at ETS | **Assessor Profile for MN201**<br>Education: bachelor's in speech/drama education, master's in special education (behaviorally disordered)<br>Certification: certified to teach speech/drama grades 7-12, language arts grades 7-12, behaviorally disordered K-12, learning disabled K-12<br>Teaching Experience: has taught special education and language arts<br>Current Position: teaches special education (grades 6-8) in an urban middle school | **Candidate Profile for MN223**<br>Education: bachelor's in special education<br>Current Position: teaching special education (gr. 7) in an urban middle school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 7 special education |
| **Assessor Profile for ET303**<br>Education: bachelor's in romance languages, master's in bilingual education, doctorate in social foundations of education<br>Certification: certified to teach secondary Spanish<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects, language arts, and bilingual/multicultural education, has college teaching experience<br>Current Position: postdoctoral researcher at ETS | **Assessor Profile for MN215**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education, master's in creative arts<br>Certification: certified to teach grades 1-6<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects, special education, arts, and language arts<br>Current Position: teaches gifted and talented (grade 6) in a suburban school system | **Candidate Profile for MN226**<br>Education: bachelor's in secondary mathematics<br>Current Position: teaching mathematics (gr. 7-8) in a low income, urban junior high school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 8 mathematics |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Assessor Profile for ET301**<br>Education: bachelor's in math, master's in public service administration and secondary counseling, doctorate in educational research methods<br>Teaching Experience: has taught post-secondary mathematics and counseling/educational psychology<br>Current Position: research associate at ETS | **Assessor Profile for DE004**<br>Education: bachelor's in social studies, master's in social sciences education<br>Certification: certified to teach social studies grades 7-12<br>Teaching Experience: has taught social sciences at secondary level, has college teaching experience<br>Current Position: educational consultant and beginning teacher supervisor in an suburban school system | **Candidate Profile for DE210**<br>Education: completing a bachelor's in elementary education<br>Current Position: student teaching in grade 2 in a suburban elementary school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 2 science |
| **Assessor Profile for ET308**<br>Education: bachelor's in mathematics education, master's and doctorate in educational administration<br>Certification: certified to teach mathematics and English grades 6-12<br>Teaching Experience: has taught language arts, mathematics, social sciences, and health<br>Current Position: educational consultant to ETS | **Assessor Profile for DE002**<br>Education: bachelor's in English (minor in French), master's in secondary English and secondary reading<br>Certification: certified to teach secondary English<br>Teaching Experience: has taught secondary language arts<br>Current Position: teaches English and French (grade 9) in a suburban school system | **Candidate Profile for DE209**<br>Education: completing a bachelor's in elementary education<br>Current Position: student teaching in grade 2 in a suburban elementary school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 2 language arts |
| **Assessor Profile for ET309**<br>Education: bachelor's in English, master's in educational psychology, doctorate in educational measurement<br>Teaching Experience: has taught grade 8 language arts, physical/biological sciences, and social sciences, has college teaching experience<br>Current Position: educational consultant to ETS | **Assessor Profile for DE006**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary and special education, master's in early childhood/special education<br>Certification: certified to teach grades 1-6, early childhood, special education<br>Teaching Experience: has taught special education<br>Current Position: supervisor of student teachers in a district encompassing urban and rural areas | **Candidate Profile for DE211**<br>Education: completing a bachelor's in elementary education<br>Current Position: student teaching in grade 5 in a suburban elementary school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 5 reading/language arts |
| **Assessor Profile for ET306**<br>Education: bachelor's in biology<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most middle school subjects, physical/biological sciences at all secondary grade levels<br>Current Position: associate examiner at ETS | **Assessor Profile for DE003**<br>Education: bachelor's in elementary education, master's in educational administration<br>Certification: certified to teach grades 1-8 all subjects<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects<br>Current Position: supervisor of student teachers in a low income suburban school system | **Candidate Profile for DE205**<br>Education: completing a bachelor's in elementary education<br>Current Position: student teaching in grade 5 in an elementary school in a low to middle income urban area<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 5 mathematics |
| **Assessor Profile for ET310**<br>Education: bachelor's in English, master's in counseling and guidance<br>Certification: certified to teach secondary English and to do guidance and counseling<br>Teaching Experience: has taught language arts at the secondary level<br>Current Position: associate examiner at ETS | **Assessor Profile for DE010**<br>Education: bachelor's in mathematics, master's in math education<br>Certification: certified to teach secondary math<br>Teaching Experience: has taught mathematics, computer science, has college teaching experience<br>Current Position: state department assessment staff | **Candidate Profile for DE214**<br>Education: completing a bachelor's in science education<br>Current Position: student teaching in grade 7 in a junior high<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 7 life sciences |
| **Assessor Profile for ET311**<br>Education: bachelor's in speech pathology, master's and doctorate in communicative disorders<br>Teaching Experience: has taught special education, language arts/communication at the college level<br>Current Position: research scientist at ETS | **Assessor Profile for DE007**<br>Education: bachelor's in biology, master's in curriculum and instruction<br>Certification: certified to teach biology and chemistry at the secondary level<br>Teaching Experience: has taught special education, mathematics, and physical/biological sciences<br>Current Position: teaches physical/biological sciences in grades 2-12 in a small town | **Candidate Profile for DE115**<br>Education: completing a bachelor's in physical education<br>Current Position: student teaching in an urban system working with grades 1-3, and 9-12<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grades 9-12 physical education |

| Assessor Profile for ET300 | Assessor Profile for MN207 | Candidate Profile for MN 246 |
|---|---|---|
| Education: bachelor's and master's in English<br>Teaching Experience: has taught college-level language arts/communication<br>Current Position: development scientist at ETS | Education: bachelor's in home economics, master's in education<br>Certification: certified to teach vocational, personal and family life science (gr. 7-12), family life (gr. 7-12)<br>Teaching Experience: has taught language arts/communication, social sciences, and home economics<br>Current Position: teaches home economics (gr. 7-12) in a rural school system | Education: bachelor's in business education<br>Current Position: teaching business and vocational education (middle school and high school) in a suburban school system<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 6 business education |
| **Assessor Profile for ET312** | **Assessor Profile for MN205** | **Candidate Profile for MN226** |
| Education: bachelor's, master's, and doctorate in psychology<br>Teaching Experience: has taught special education, social sciences, counseling/educational psychology, educational foundations<br>Current Position: senior development leader at ETS | Education: bachelor's in mathematics<br>Certification: certified to teach grades 1-6<br>Teaching Experience: has taught mathematics and physical/biological sciences<br>Current Position: teaches mathematics in a middle school in a low income, urban school system | Education: bachelor's in secondary mathematics<br>Current Position: teaching mathematics in a low income, urban junior high school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grades 7-8 mathematics |
| **Assessor Profile for ET313** | **Assessor Profile for MN201** | **Candidate Profile for MN230** |
| Education: bachelor's and master's in studio art<br>Current Position: senior examiner at ETS | Education: bachelor's in speech/drama education, master's in special education (behaviorally disordered)<br>Certification: certified to teach speech/drama grades 7-12, language arts grades 7-12, behaviorally disordered K-12, learning disabled K-12<br>Teaching Experience: has taught special education and language arts<br>Current Position: teaches special education (gr. 6-8) in an urban middle school | Education: bachelor's in music education<br>Current Position: teaching vocal music in a low to middle income, urban junior high school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grades 7-8 vocal music |
| **Assessor Profile for ET302** | **Assessor Profile for MN214** | **Candidate Profile for MN252** |
| Education: bachelor's in elementary education, master's in psychology<br>Certification: certified to teach elementary K-8, gifted education K-12<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects, gifted education K-12, language arts, and social sciences<br>Current Position: associate examiner at ETS | Education: bachelor's in elementary education and history, master's in elementary education<br>Certification: certified to teach grades 1-6<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary and middle school subjects, has college teaching and staff development experience<br>Current Position: staff development director and mentor director in a suburban school system | Education: bachelor's in social studies<br>Current Position: teaching social sciences in a suburban high school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 9 civics |
| **Assessor Profile for ET303** | **Assessor Profile for MN217** | **Candidate Profile for MN245** |
| Education: bachelor's in romance languages, master's in bilingual education, doctorate in social foundations of education<br>Certification: certified to teach secondary Spanish<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects, language arts, and bilingual/multicultural education, has college teaching experience<br>Current Position: postdoctoral researcher at ETS | Education: (missing data)<br>Certification: (missing data)<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects, gifted and talented education, language arts, mathematics, social sciences, business/vocational education, and health and physical education<br>Current Position: guidance counselor (gr. 9-12) in a suburban school system | Education: bachelor's in technology education (minor in drivers education)<br>Current Position: teaching business and vocational education in a suburban high school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: high school drivers education |
| **Assessor Profile for ET309** | **Assessor Profile for MN215** | **Candidate Profile for MN241** |
| Education: bachelor's in English, master's in educational psychology, doctorate in educational measurement<br>Teaching Experience: has taught grade 8 language arts, physical/biological sciences, and social sciences, has college teaching experience<br>Current Position: educational consultant to ETS | Education: bachelor's in elementary education, master's in creative arts<br>Certification: certified to teach grades 1-6<br>Teaching Experience: has taught all or most elementary subjects, special education, arts, and language arts<br>Current Position: teaches gifted and talented (grade 6) in a suburban school system | Education: bachelor's in biology education<br>Current Position: teaching physical/biological sciences in a suburban high school<br>Lesson for Evaluation: grade 10 biology |

87

88

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# Appendix E: Criterion Descriptions and Scoring Rules
(Fall 1991 Version)

D R A F T

September 23, 1991

Domain A. Organizing Content Knowledge for Teaching

A thorough knowledge of the content to be taught is essential for good instructional planning, effective teaching, and informative evaluation of the results. Teachers must have adequate understanding of their subject matter to design or select appropriate activities and instructional materials; to sequence instruction in ways that will help students to meet short- and long-term curricular goals; and to design informative evaluation strategies.

Domain A concerns the teacher's understanding of content, clarity in setting goals, and skill in selecting or designing activities, instructional materials, and evaluation strategies aligned to these goals.

A1: Demonstrating application of content knowledge through accurate instruction

A2: Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was studied previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be studied in the future

A3: Creating or selecting appropriate instructional materials/other resources and learning activities that are clearly linked to the goals or intents of the lesson

A4: Creating or selecting appropriate evaluation strategies that are clearly linked to the goals or intents of the lesson

A1 Demonstrating application of content knowledge through accurate instruction

Description:

This criterion relates to the accuracy of a teacher's content knowledge. It is essential that content be regarded in its broadest sense, to include not only the knowledge and skills inherent in the subject matter being taught, but also essential thinking skills, social skills of group process and collaborative work, and the many values (such as enjoyment of music, or respect for one's peers) that are inherent in the curriculum.

It is also important that a teacher's knowledge of a discipline be adequate to avoid content errors. It is important to recognize that when advanced students are conducting independent investigations they may explore questions to which teachers do not know the answers. But even in that case the teacher should know the discipline well enough to guide student learning.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher exhibit accurate knowledge of the content?

2. Does the teacher make content errors in the presentation of the lesson?

3. If students' presentation of content is inaccurate, is the inaccuracy corrected, by the teacher or other students?

Evidence:

Evidence for A1 is found in answers to question 2 in the pre-observation conference/interview, as well as during the classroom observation. It may also emerge in answers to other questions in the pre- or post-observation conference.

Scoring Rules

A1

0. The teacher repeatedly makes major content errors.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. Content is basically accurate. Minor errors may occur.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. Content presented is accurate.

5. Above Level 4

A2 Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was studied previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be studied in the future

Description:

This criterion refers to a teacher's understanding of the structure or hierarchy of a discipline, and how knowledge of one element is prerequisite to learning another. It involves the appropriate sequencing of learning activities, and knowledge of where the current lesson fits within the broader scope of the discipline as a whole. In order to do this, the teacher cannot simply be one step ahead of the students. Rather, a teacher must possess or develop over time a depth of content knowledge that permits ease in presenting new material, flexibility in responding to students' ideas, and skill in diagnosing student difficulties in learning.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Can the teacher explain how the content he or she has planned for today connects to what students have previously learned?

2. Can the teacher explain how the content he or she has planned for today connects to what students will study in the future?

3. Can the teacher explain how today's lesson fits with larger goals of learning in the discipline?

Evidence:

Evidence for A2 is found in answers to question(s) 2 and 6 in the pre-observation conference/interview, during the classroom observation, and in question 6 in the post-observation conference.

Scoring Rules

A2

0. The teacher shows evidence of lack of understanding of the concept of relating lessons to one another.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher demonstrates general understanding of how the content relates to material previously taught and remaining to be taught.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher demonstrates in-depth understanding of how the content relates to material previously taught and remaining to be taught.

5. Above Level 4

A3 **Creating or selecting appropriate instructional materials/other resources and learning activities that are clearly linked to the goals or intents of the lesson**

Description:

A knowledgeable teacher is able to express his or her goals for a lesson in terms of learning outcomes for students, either as individuals or as members of a group. The goals should not be confused with learning activities, which are means of carrying out the teacher's goals.

Instructional materials are those resources that students use to learn the content of the lesson. In some situations, no instructional materials are needed. If instructional materials are used, they may support any type of lesson. They need not be elaborate or expensive, and they may be "found" materials. It is important only that the materials selected are appropriate to the goal(s) of the lesson.

Learning activities include both what the teacher does and what the students do in order to learn the content of the lesson. Learning activities may involve students in the large group, in small groups, or individually. They should be designed to enhance the learning experience whether the format is through teacher presentation, teacher-led discussion, structured small group work, or independent work. Depending on the context, they may be teacher-directed or student-initiated, or at any point in between. The learning activities must, however, support the goals of the lesson.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Can the teacher articulate the goals or objectives of the lesson?
2. Are the materials selected by the teacher appropriate and clearly linked to the goals of the lesson?
3. Does the teacher's choice of instructional materials enhance the learning experience for the students?
4. Can the teacher explain why he or she chose these specific instructional materials for this particular lesson, given the lesson goals? How will using these materials help students reach the goals of the lesson?
5. Are the learning activities clearly linked to the goals of the lesson?
6. Are the learning activities designed to enhance the learning experience for students ?

Evidence:

Evidence for A3 is found in questions 1-3 in the instruction profile, in questions 3-4 in the pre-observation conference, during the classroom observation, in questions 2-3 in the post-observation conference, and in materials and handouts the teacher has prepared.

Scoring Rules

A3

0. The teacher cannot state what the students are expected to learn, or the teacher chooses materials or activities that are obviously unrelated to the goals of the lesson or that represent a gross misunderstanding of the purpose of activities or materials. The activities or materials are viewed as ends in themselves, unrelated to the instructional goals.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The materials and/or activities chosen by the teacher are related to the goals or intents of the lesson.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. In addition to the requirement for Level 2, the materials and/or activities selected are appropriate for most of the students, and represent an effective means of achieving the goals or intents of the lesson.

5. Above Level 4

A4 Creating or selecting appropriate evaluation strategies that are clearly linked to the intents or goals of the lesson

Description:

It is only through well-designed evaluation strategies that a teacher knows whether students have learned the content of the lesson and can plan, if necessary, additional learning experiences. Evaluation strategies must be aligned to, and reflect, the goals of the lesson. If the goals relate to individual student learning, then the plan for evaluation should do so, too; if the goals relate to small or large group outcomes, then the plan for evaluation should do so also.

Ultimately, it is the teacher who must evaluate student learning. However, many teachers, through student self-evaluation or peer evaluation, involve students in that process. A plan for evaluation of student learning may include a variety of formats.

The teacher may create evaluation strategies or select them from the instructional materials used. An example of the former is a teacher-made test; an example of the latter is the chapter test from a textbook.

Evaluation strategies need not be formal, such as a test. They may be any approach that is suitable to the goal(s) of the lesson. For certain types of goals, tests may be less appropriate than is observation of student performance. Evaluation may be informal, but it must be sufficiently systematic to provide the teacher with useful information about the extent to which the instructional goals--whether individual or group--have been met.

Evaluation strategies may be implemented at a later time than the observed lesson. While some monitoring of student learning occurs on a daily basis, in class, most systematic evaluation is separated in time (possibly only a day or two) from instruction.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Are the evaluation strategies appropriate and clearly linked to the learning goals of the lesson?

2. Are the evaluation strategies designed to provide the teacher with useful information about the extent to which instructional goals have been met?

Evidence:

Evidence for A4 is found in questions 1 and 4 in the instruction profile and question 5 in the pre-observation conference, possibly during the classroom observation, and in question 4 in the post-observation conference. It will also be found in the actual evaluation instruments (tests, quizzes, scoring guides for essays) that the teacher has prepared.

Scoring Rules

A4

0. The teacher has made no provision for evaluating students' work.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher has planned at least one evaluation strategy that is aligned with the goals of the lesson.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher has planned multiple evaluation strategies over time that are clearly linked to the instructional goals.

5. Above Level 4

Domain B: Teaching for student learning

This domain relates to the connections that are developed between students and content. As used here, "content" refers to traditional academic subject matter as well as to the skills, abilities, perceptions, etc., involved in subjects such as visual and performing arts, vocational/technical education, and physical education. There are many ways through which teachers can make content comprehensible to students: teachers can provide direct instruction, they may be facilitators, or even observers in classroom settings they have structured so that students can work independently. Thus, in different ways, teachers help students establish a relationship with the content. Whatever the level and nature of students' involvement, teachers are responsible for directing the learners in the process of establishing individual connections with the content and thereby devising a good "fit" for the content within the framework of their own knowledge, interests, abilities, cultural and personal backgrounds, etc. The teacher guides and monitors students in the process of assimilating the content, making certain that what is learned is factually and procedurally correct.

B1: Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultures

B2: Helping students activate relevant aspects of their prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultural resources in order to promote learning

B3: Making content comprehensible to students

B4: Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands

B5: Setting high expectations for each student, making learning expectations clear to students, and helping students accept responsibility for their own learning

B6: Encouraging students to extend their own thinking

B7: Using instructional time effectively

B1 **Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultures**

This criterion refers to the teacher's awareness of the students' current relationship to the content being studied. It refers to more than just a pre-assessment of students' factual knowledge or skills. Teachers must develop an understanding of students' abilities, interests, and prior school experiences as well as experiences outside of school. Teachers should develop an appreciation of the various cultural resources their students possess, particularly when diverse cultures are represented in the classroom. Such understanding must relate to the specific students or groups of students being taught; teachers should guard against making stereotypical judgements about students. The extent to which it is possible for teachers to become familiar with their students' prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and resources will vary widely depending on the number of students in the classroom, the diversity of their cultural backgrounds, the amount of time each day the teacher spends with a particular group, etc. In many cases, teachers might be expected to have learned a great deal about each individual; under some circumstances, such as a schedule and teaching load that assigns hundreds of students to one teacher, the teacher may only be able to gain a general sensitivity for the background of the students as a group.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher know how to find out about students' personal and/or cultural resources?

2. Does the teacher demonstrate familiarity with students' foundation for understanding of the content?

3. Does the teacher demonstrate an awareness of the personal and/or cultural resources that students bring with them to the classroom?

Evidence:

Evidence for B1 may be found in questions 1-13 in the class profile and question 8 in the pre-observation, conference and during the classroom observation. Evidence for B1 seen during the classroom observation may involve interactions between the teacher and the class as a group or between the teacher and individual students.

Scoring Rules

B1

0. The teacher is not familiar with background knowledge that the students already possess, does not know how to find out about it, and has no inclination to do so.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher knows where or how to get information about students' relevant prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultures.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher knows about students' relevant prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultures.

5. Above Level 4

B2 **Helping students to activate relevant aspects of their prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultural resources in order to promote learning**

This criterion is an extension of B1, and refers to the ways in which the teacher helps students to make connections between their personal store of knowledge, skills, etc., and the content being studied. The teacher may accomplish this through reviews, direct questions, discussions, and other means of engaging students and helping them establish mental links between what they know and what they will be learning.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher initiate interactions with or among students which help them connect with the content?

2. Are students able to use their prior knowledge, etc., to help them understand the new content? Are they able to integrate the new information with existing knowledge?

Evidence:

Because this criterion focuses on the learner, evidence for B2 should come primarily from the classroom observation. Question 7 in the pre-observation conference/interview may help to clarify what was seen during the observation.

Scoring Rules

B2

0. The teacher discourages students from making links between today's lesson and what they already know.

1. Above level 0, below Level 2

---

2. The teacher organizes instruction in such a way that students make a connection with something they have previously learned either in or out of school.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. In addition to the requirement for Level 2, the teacher demonstrates flexibility in helping students make connections between the content being taught and their background knowledge and experiences.

5. Above Level 4

B3 **Making content comprehensible to students**

This criterion is concerned with ways in which the teacher facilitates student learning. The teacher should try to engage students with the content in ways that are meaningful to them. The teacher should be able to organize instruction, for example, through explanations, descriptions, examples, analogies, metaphors, demonstrations, discussions, learning activities, and so forth. These strategies may be used in direct instruction by the teacher, or they can be incorporated into lessons where students are given more control over the learning environment. The teacher is not limited to one or two such strategies to facilitate a given lesson; depending on the situation, the teacher will draw on the repertoire of strategies at her or his disposal. For content to be comprehensible to students, the teacher's approach should be appropriate to the learners and to the content being studied.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher communicate clearly and accurately?

2. In lessons that are not teacher-directed, has the teacher structured the learning environment in a way that enables students to understand the content?

3. Does the teacher represent the content in ways that are appropriate to the learners and to the content being studied?

Evidence:

Evidence for this criterion is found primarily during the classroom observation. Questions in the class and instruction profiles and the pre-observation conference/interview should give the observer a good idea of what to look for during the observation itself. It may be necessary to clarify, as part of the post-observation conference/interview, the teacher's reasons for selecting a particular approach or the way in which this strategy was implemented.

Scoring Rules

B3

0. The teacher structures learning in such a confusing way that very few students could be expected to understand what is being taught. The teacher may appear to know the subject matter, but is unable to communicate it effectively to students.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher structures learning in such a way that most students could reasonably be expected to understand.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. In addition to the requirement for Level 2, the students show evidence of having understood the content of the lesson.

5. Above Level 4

B4 **Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands.**

This criterion refers to monitoring, feedback, and adjustment that takes place during the lesson. First, the teacher should continually monitor the students' understanding of the content during instruction, for example, by checking written work, asking questions, or paying attention to nonverbal cues from students. The teacher can give the students feedback to reinforce those who are on track and redirect or assist those who need extra help. Feedback can take the form of specific comments to individuals, or remarks to groups of students, or may it be nonverbal. Depending how instruction is organized, it can come from other sources, such as other students, the structure or process of an activity, etc. The teacher should use information gained from monitoring students' understanding to continually assess the effectiveness of the particular instructional approach in use. If the chosen learning activities are not working as intended, or if the students are having unexpected problems, the teacher should adjust the activities as necessary.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Is the teacher in touch with the learners? Does the teacher check for student understanding as the lesson progresses?

2. Does the teacher give the students feedback, individually and/or as a group? Or, if appropriate, do the students get feedback from other sources?

3. Does the teacher adjust the learning activity if a particular approach does not seem to be working?

Evidence:

Evidence for B4 will be found mainly in the classroom observation. Question 19 in the class profile may help observers to place what is to be observed in context, and question 4 in the post-observation conference/interview may help to clarify a particular action of the teacher's. The conferences alone cannot provide sufficient evidence for this criterion, which is concerned with the teacher's ability to monitor and adjust instructional effectiveness during the lesson.

Scoring Rules

B4

0. The teacher makes no attempt to find out whether students have understood. If it is obvious that students do not understand, the teacher makes no attempt to adapt to students who do not understand.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher determines whether the students, as a group, are comprehending the content and may attempt to adjust instruction if necessary. There is evidence of basic communication to indicate to students if they are generally on the right track or if they have made errors.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher determines whether individual students or subgroups of students are comprehending the content and makes appropriate instructional adjustments if necessary. Students receive substantive and specific feedback.

5. Above Level 4

B5 **Setting high expectations for each student, making learning expectations clear to students, and helping students accept responsibility for their own learning.**

Students must know that school is a place for learning, and that they can succeed. The teacher must convey the attitude that all students are capable of learning the content being studied. It is not necessary or even desirable that the teacher have identical expectations for each individual, but the teacher must convey a belief that each student is capable of significant achievement. The teacher must encourage each student to recognize his or her own responsibility in the learning process, which may be considered an active partnership between teacher and student.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher convey what is expected of the students?
2. Do the students demonstrate a clear understanding of expectations that may have been explicitly stated by the teacher prior to the observation?
3. Does the teacher show, by words, actions, and/or attitude, that each student is capable of meaningful achievement?
4. Are expectations communicated to students in a way that helps them to recognize and accept responsibility for their own learning?
5. Is instruction organized in such a way that students have opportunities to take responsibility for aspects of their own learning?

Evidence:

The teacher's attitude toward student achievement may be expressed either directly or indirectly, and evidence may be found in answers to questions 7-8 in the post-observation conference/interview and/or the classroom observation.

Scoring Rules

B5

0. The teacher communicates to the group or to individuals that they are incapable of learning, or that expectations for their learning are very low.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher communicates to the students explicitly or implicitly, that they are expected to learn. The teacher avoids communicating to any student the message that he or she is not expected to learn any of the content that is being taught.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher communicates learning expectations that constitute an appropriate challenge; i.e., that are neither too high nor too low. There is also evidence of students taking responsibility for their own learning.

5. Above Level 4

B6 Encouraging students to extend their thinking

Whatever the level of students' current thinking, it can always be extended. Teachers should create or recognize opportunities to help students move beyond their current level of thinking; to think independently, creatively, and/or critically. Teachers may encourage students to formulate new concepts or hypotheses, e.g. in science; to make connections among facts and ideas; to recognize patterns, e.g. in music, art, or mathematics; to create an original work; to apply learning to an unfamiliar problem; in general, to challenge students to draw upon their personal resources and extend their relationships with the content and with the world around them, including other people. The teacher must be able to take advantage of opportunities to introduce new ways of thinking and to incorporate them into the content being studied so that all students can benefit.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher recognize opportunities to help students extend their thinking?

2. Does the teacher challenge students in ways relevant to their abilities, cultural resources, etc.? Is the teacher able to use the current content appropriately as a springboard to new ways of thinking?

3. Is the teacher able to successfully integrate unexpected but important digressions into the lesson being taught?

Evidence:

Evidence of the teacher's awareness of the importance of B6 may come from the pre-observation and post-observation conferences/interview, but the teacher's ability to help students extend their thinking will be evidenced primarily in the classroom observation.

Scoring Rules

B6

0. The teacher makes it clear that students are only expected to learn the material in a rote manner, not to think about it.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. There is evidence that the teacher is encouraging students to extend thinking relevant to the content. The teacher avoids any words or actions that would discourage students from extending their thinking.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher includes in instruction activities, methods and/or processes that actively encourage students to think independently, creatively and/or critically about the content being taught.

5. Above Level 4

B7 **Using instructional time effectively**

This criterion refers to the teacher's ability to use time effectively. The effective use of time is related to the teacher's ability to pace the lesson so that students are actively engaged in learning. In well-paced instruction, the amount of time spent on learning activities is appropriate to the content, the learners, and the situation. Digressions from planned activities do not constitute a waste of time if they result in valuable learning. The pace of the lesson should be appropriate for the content and students.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Was the lesson well-paced; that is, was the amount of time allotted to each activity appropriate?

2. If an adjustment to the planned lesson was necessary, e.g. due to unexpected student difficulty with the material, was the adjustment made smoothly and effectively?

Evidence:

Although direct evidence is primarily from the classroom observation, question 3 in the instruction profile will help place the actual lesson in context, i.e. if the lesson deviates significantly from what was planned, this may constitute negative or positive evidence. If the digression resulted in an opportunity for valuable learning, then this would be positive evidence. It may be necessary to clarify the effects of any unplanned events during the post-observation conference/interview.

Scoring Rules

B7

0. The pace of instruction is completely inappropriate or excessive amounts of time are wasted.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher paces instruction appropriately for most of the students for most of the observation period.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. In addition to the requirements for Level 2 the teacher paces instruction so that activities flow smoothly and makes effective use of the available instructional time.

5. Above Level 4

DOMAIN C: Creating an Environment for Student Learning

A safe, well-functioning learning environment is one in which a broad range of teaching and learning experiences can take place. Learning is maximized when both teacher and students establish a sense of community in which they develop and practice classroom routines, rules, and standards of behavior. A climate of shared responsibility fosters equitable and mutually respectful relationships among students, and between students and teacher.

C1: Creating a purposeful and well-functioning learning community with convenient and well-understood classroom routines

C2: Making the physical environment as conducive to learning as possible

C3: Establishing and consistently maintaining clear standards of behavior

C4: Creating a climate that ensures equity and respect for and among students, and between students and the teacher

C5: Establishing and maintaining rapport with students in ways that are appropriate to the students' developmental levels

C1 **Creating a purposeful and well-functioning learning community with convenient and well-understood classroom routines**

Description:

This criterion relates to the teacher's ability to establish a learning environment in which classroom routines and procedures facilitate student learning by making necessary, non-instructional processes as efficient as is reasonable and desirable. The classroom might be viewed essentially as a place where teacher and students interact socially and intellectually while engaged with the content they are learning. Routines and procedures should be viewed as providing a structure that helps the teacher to make as much class time as possible available for students' active engagement with content. Classroom rules that pertain directly to such issues of managing time also fall within this criterion.

It is important to focus attention on "purposeful and well-functioning" here, since this is the point of creating and maintaining a system of routines, procedures, and/or rules--they support the teaching/learning activity by allowing students to behave responsibly and, in many situations, to exercise authority they have been given. "Convenient and well-understood routines" should not be interpreted as implying that all classrooms should look alike; there is a wide range of possibilities influenced by context, teacher preferences, etc.

If students and teachers have a common understanding of what the routines, procedures, and/or rules mean, and there is agreement as to their importance, the classroom operates more efficiently, thereby enabling the teacher and students to get on with the task of learning.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Are routines and procedures evident?

2. Is there inferential evidence of previously established routines?

3. If the class appears chaotic or disorganized, is there evidence that routines are in place nonetheless?

Evidence:

Supporting information for C1 can be found in questions 14, 16, 17, and 18 of the class profile. Evidence for C1 is most likely seen in the classroom observation, but might need confirmation in the post-conference if questions arise during the observation. It should not be assumed, for example, that a seemingly chaotic, disorganized classroom is automatically evidence of poor routines or violation of classroom rules. Evidence might also be observed at the beginning and/or end of a class, when the teacher is initiating or concluding a lesson.

Scoring Rules

C1

0. The class functions chaotically, without apparent routines.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. There is evidence of an attempt to implement classroom routines appropriate to and understood by the students.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. Classroom routines are implemented smoothly and students understand what is expected of them.

5. Above Level 4

C2 Making the physical environment as conducive to learning as possible

Description:

This criterion focuses on the physical setting in which learning is to take place--the level of harmony or match between the arrangement of the learning environment and the planned lesson or activity. Additionally, student safety and students' diverse educational and physical needs fall within the context of this criterion. It is essential to consider the degree of control that the teacher has over the situation. For example, if the furniture is securely anchored to the floor, or the teacher is itinerant, serious limitations are placed on the teacher's opportunities to demonstrate competence in this area.

When the teacher does have control of the learning space, attention should focus on the effect that the physical arrangements have on learning. For example, the room should be organized so that all are able to participate. In some situations, for example, lab sciences, it is especially important for the arrangement to reflect a concern for students' safety. If the teacher has no control over the physical environment, attention should shift to how the teacher adjusts the lesson/activity to the setting, despite the handicap.

Another factor to consider in this criterion is the affective dimension of the physical setting--the space should reflect evidence of student learning. The presence or absence of student work, the "attractiveness" of the space, and the degree of overall appeal as a place for learning are variables in this aspect of the criterion. Though subjective, it is part of the decision concerning "conducive to learning" included here.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher have control over the physical environment?
2. Is there a match (to the extent possible) between the lesson/activity and the furniture/room configuration?
3. How does the room reflect the learning that takes place there?
4. Are any safety violations evident?
5. Do all students have both visual and auditory access to the lesson?
6. Is there evidence of student work displayed in the classroom?

Evidence:

Supporting information for C2 may be found in answers to questions 15, 20 and 21 of the class profile. Most of the evidence for C2 should be visible, though there are aspects of this criterion which will not be. Displays of student work, evidence of student activity and works in process, teaching aids, etc. are physical evidence. Teacher planning of class projects, writing assignments, etc., will provide another source of evidence which will be gained through conferences and observation. Safety and equal visual/auditory access to learning should be observable, but clarification regarding students with special needs might be best learned in the pre- or post-conference.

Scoring Rules

C2

0. Aspects of the classroom environment that are under the teacher's control present a clear threat to the physical safety or effective participation of some or all of the students.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. To the extent possible, the teacher creates a physically safe environment in which all students can participate. Provisions are made to accommodate students with special needs.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. In addition to the requirements for Level 2, the teacher arranges the physical environment to facilitate learning. If the teacher does not control the physical environment, he or she accommodates existing physical characteristics effectively.

5. Above Level 4

C3 Establishing and consistently maintaining clear standards of behavior

Description:

This criterion refers to the desired kind of classroom behavior that will ensure an appropriate climate for learning, as well as the establishment and maintenance of those standards of behavior. Students need to know the limits of acceptable behavior. Setting clear standards that define appropriate behavior and its boundaries permits both students and teacher to develop realistic behavior patterns for the classroom. Once established, communicated, and accepted, these standards of behavior must be maintained consistently, yet there must also be flexibility to allow for the exceptions that inevitably occur.

Rules that relate to student behavior fall within the scope of this criterion. It is important for teachers to communicate not only their preferred student classroom behavior, but also the consequences when standards (both those expressed as rules and those expressed more informally) are violated. In evaluating how (and whether) standards of behavior have been established and maintained, it is important to keep in mind that a range of ways of managing behavior can contribute to various kinds of positive learning environments.

It is also important that good classroom behavior receive attention. Negative behavior is easy to see; good behavior is often taken for granted.

Questions for Assessor Reflection

1. Are standards of classroom behavior evident?
2. How are/were standards communicated to students?
3. Does the teacher post rules of behavior for class and visitors?
4. Do established standards of behavior contribute to a positive learning environment?
5. How are the rules enforced and standards maintained?

Evidence:

Supporting information for C3 may be found in answers to questions 14 and 18 on the class profile. Evidence for C3 will obviously be demonstrated in classroom observation, but might also be found in either the pre- or post-observation conference/interview if clarification is necessary. It is also possible that the teacher will create and distribute a list of behavioral expectations to his or her students; if so, such a list might be volunteered or solicited. Additional evidence might have to be inferred--if no behavior problems arise, it may be because of clear established standards of behavior.

Scoring Rules

C3

0. Student misbehavior is both frequent and serious; the teacher makes no attempt or inappropriate attempts to respond to misbehavior.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The students' behavior is generally appropriate or the teacher's response to misbehavior is generally appropriate.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The students' behavior is consistently appropriate or the teacher's response to misbehavior is consistently appropriate.

5. Above Level 4

C4 Creating a climate that ensures equity and respect for and among students, and between students and the teacher

Description:

This criterion is concerned with the teacher's ability to facilitate and maintain equitable and respectful classroom interactions among students and between students and the teacher. The teacher should consistently model good examples of both equity and respect. Teachers must be equitable in their treatment of students of different genders, ethnicity, cultural backgrounds, and socio-economic levels. The teacher should understand the varied ways respect is expressed by different groups of students. Teachers' responses, and the kinds of interactions they foster, should be geared toward supporting the dignity and sense of personal worth of all students. Comments about student effort/work in all classroom situations must be positive and constructive.

Important, also, is the establishment of a classroom atmosphere in which mutual respect is consistently fostered and exercised. Again, the teacher is a prime contributor in establishing this climate. Praise to high achievers only, determining "favorites," and negative stereotyping are negative examples of teacher behavior; constructive responses to wrong answers, calling students by preferred names, and using positive, accepting language are examples of positive behavior. An attitude that all students are of equal importance, and that they will receive equal opportunity and attention, is the ideal to be maintained.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Is the teacher equitable in interactions with students during the observed class period?

2. Are there patterns of either exclusion or overattention in student/teacher interactions?

3. Does the teacher use negative stereotypes?

4. Is the teacher inappropriately negative in remarks to students?

5. Do students treat each other with respect?

6. Does the teacher respond appropriately to disrespectful or stereotype-based comments by students?

Evidence:

Supporting information may be found in questions 1-14, 16 and 18 of the class profile. Evidence for C4 will be found primarily in the classroom observation. Both positive and negative examples can be observed, but if in doubt as to whether or not a particular behavior was a violation, the post-conference can provide clarification.

Scoring Rules

C4

0. The teacher is physically or verbally disrespectful toward students, or tolerates or condones such behavior on the part of others.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher avoids any clearly inequitable behavior. The teacher does not tolerate obviously disrespectful actions toward himself/herself or among students, nor does he or she treat students disrespectfully.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. In addition to the requirement for Level 2, the teacher actively encourages equity and respect. Either the students generally behave respectfully to each other and to the teacher or the teacher takes advantages of opportunities to encourage such behavior.

5. Above Level 4

C5 **Establishing and maintaining rapport with students in ways that are appropriate to the students' developmental levels**

Description:

This criterion is concerned with the teacher's ability to effectively and positively relate to his or her students. The successful teacher might be characterized as demonstrating genuine concern, warmth, sincerity, humor and caring. Effective interpersonal and communication skills are additional attributes which contribute to establishing rapport. It is here that the teacher personalizes learning. Subtle indicators can include eye contact, a smile, focused comments, proximity, a friendly joke, etc.

Consciously exhibiting interest in who students are, how they are unique individuals, showing respect for traditions and customs of students with differing cultural backgrounds, and taking time to listen to students are further aids to establishing rapport.

It is important in this criterion to account for the many ways rapport might be demonstrated. Teachers, like students, are diverse; because teacher/student rapport can be manifested in so many different ways, one must be careful to consider the existence or lack of rapport in specific rather than general terms.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. How does the teacher demonstrate rapport?

2. In what ways has the teacher shown that he or she is concerned about students? that he or she cares about them?

3. In what ways has the teacher "tailored" rapport to meet the individual differences of his or her students?

Evidence:

Evidence for C5 will be seen most obviously in the classroom observation. There should be a variety of indicators throughout the observed time period. If in doubt concerning teacher actions--was a unique glance, a prolonged pause, or use of an unusual phrase or expression, a manifestation of that teacher's rapport?--clarification can be made in the post-conference.

Scoring Rules

C5

0. Students are fearful of the teacher, or act in hostile or inappropriately familiar ways toward the teacher, and it is clear from the situation that their attitude is attributable to the teacher's behavior.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher makes an attempt to relate to the students as people. The students act neither obviously fearful nor openly hostile to the teacher.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The students appear to feel comfortable in the classroom setting and free to participate appropriately. The teacher communicates positively with students and demonstrates concern and sincerity, when and where appropriate.

5. Above Level 4

DOMAIN D: Teacher Professionalism

Teachers need to be able to evaluate their own instructional effectiveness in order to plan future lessons for particular classes and to improve their teaching in general. They should be able to discuss the degree to which different aspects of a lesson were successful in terms of instructional approaches, student responses, and learning outcomes. Teachers should be able to explain how they will use their assessment of their instructional effectiveness on a given day to guide their planning and to improve their teaching. The professional responsibilities of teachers also include sharing appropriate information with other professionals and with families in ways that support the learning of diverse student populations.

D1: Reflecting on the extent to which the instructional goals were met

D2: Explaining how insights gained from instructional experience can be used subsequently

D3: Demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for student learning

D4: Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and coordinate learning activities for students

D5: Communicating with families regarding student learning and, where appropriate, interacting effectively with the community

**D1 Reflecting on the extent to which the instructional goals were met**

This criterion focuses on the teacher's ability to determine the extent to which the students in the class met the instructional goals or intents that were stated for the observed lesson. This also includes recognizing what worked and didn't work during the lesson. The teacher is expected to provide evidence for judgments about students' progress toward the goals. Such evidence could include (but is not limited to) the teacher's own observations during the observed lesson, student responses during the lesson, student work samples from the lesson, etc. As a teacher's ability to make such determinations develops, he or she should be able to determine the extent to which subgroups of students or individuals met the goals.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Can the teacher make an accurate judgment about the extent to which the goals were met?

2. Can the teacher support his or her judgment with appropriate evidence?

3. Can the teacher state whether individual students or groups of students met some or all of the goals?

Evidence:

Evidence for D1 is found primarily in questions 1-4 in the post-observation conference/interview.

Scoring Rules[1]

D1

0. The teacher is unable to relate the goals of instruction to what has just happened in the classroom. She or he thus cannot tell if the instructional goals were met.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher identifies whether goals were met, and provides a basic rationale for his or her judgment. The teacher's judgment and rationale are consistent with evidence in the documentation.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. In addition to the requirement for Level 2, the teacher provides a more complex or detailed rationale for his or her judgment. The teacher's judgment and rationale are consistent with evidence in the assessor's documentation.

5. Above Level 4

[1] (If the assessor disagrees with the teacher, the assessor must be able to find evidence in the documentation to support his or her reasons for disagreeing.)

D2 **Explaining how insights gained from instructional experience can be used subsequently**

This criterion focuses on the teacher's ability to use his or her own reflection on and analysis of teaching to derive insights from the lesson observed. This includes analyzing the effectiveness of the observed lesson, deciding how to follow up the observed lesson with these students, and considering how to improve one's instruction more generally, with this and other groups of students. If the teacher adjusted the lesson in ways that involved significant changes from what was planned, the teacher should be able to explain why those changes were made and to evaluate whether they contributed to students' progress toward the goals. This criterion is aimed at assessing the ability to analyze one's own teaching during a particular lesson in terms of both successes and areas needing improvement.

The insights a teacher might derive from a lesson could be related to both information about a student or group of students (e.g., student responses to particular examples, the pace at which students learned something, the interest of students in a particular topic) and information about teaching and planning instruction more generally (e.g., information related to classroom management techniques, instructional design). Such insights can also range from relatively specific comments about the observed lesson to relatively broad comments about ways of organizing and presenting the content.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Is the teacher able to analyze the effectiveness of his or her teaching strategies?

2. Is the teacher able to articulate how insights gained from this lesson could be used to improve future instruction?

3. If the teacher encountered difficulties during the observed lesson, can he or she identify any reasonable possible causes for the difficulties?

4. If significant changes were made from the planned lesson, can the teacher explain why the changes were made or whether they were helpful?

Evidence:

Evidence for D2 is found primarily in answers to questions 5-6 on the post-observation conference/interview.

Scoring Rules[1]

D2

0. The teacher provides no insights or the teacher expresses extremely inaccurate "insights," according to evidence in the assessor's documentation.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. Based on his or her reflection, the teacher derives general insights about the observed lesson and provides a basic description of how these insights could be integrated into future instruction.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher derives substantive insights, supported by specific evidence from the observed lesson, and explains how he or she would use these insights in future instruction.

5. Above Level 4

[1] (If the assessor disagrees with the teacher, the assessor must be able to find evidence in the documentation to support his or her reasons for disagreeing.)

D3 Demonstrating acceptance of responsibility for student learning

This criterion focuses on the teacher's sense of responsibility and efficacy in promoting learning by all students. The teacher's understanding of how instructional decisions affect student learning should be combined with high but realistic expectations for learning on the part of all students. If students attained the instructional goals, the teacher should understand how his or her instructional decisions contributed to the positive outcomes. If the students did not attain the goals, the teacher should not use their background characteristics a reason for the lesson's ineffectiveness. A primary source of evidence for this criterion is the teacher's openness to finding alternate ways of organizing instruction for students who do not attain the stated instructional goals of the observed lesson. Statements from the teacher indicating there is little or nothing he or she can do to teach the students are examples of negative evidence.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher convey, explicitly or implicitly, a commitment to promoting all students' learning?

2. Does the teacher make any statements that would be contradictory to such a commitment?

Evidence:

Evidence for D3 can be found primarily in answers to questions 7-8 on the post-observation conference/interview. Supporting information may be found in the answer to question 19 on the class profile.

Scoring Rules

D3

0. The teacher fails to accept professional responsibility for what goes on in the classroom.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher demonstrates commitment to taking responsibility for students' learning.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. In addition to the requirements for Level 2, the teacher shows evidence (either during the interview or the lesson) of accepting responsibility for student learning. The teacher conveys a strong sense of security that he or she can teach in ways that will enable any student to learn.

5. Above Level 4

D4 Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and coordinate learning activities for students

This criterion focuses on two distinct, though related, aspects of a teacher's professional relationships with colleagues: (1) seeking help from other professionals with the goal of improving student learning and (2) coordinating plans and schedules and sharing resources for the benefit of students and student learning.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Can the teacher identify colleagues within the school who could provide or have provided instructional help that is relevant to the observed lesson or to students in the class?

2. If appropriate, can the teacher identify colleagues whose participation is either necessary or helpful to coordinate learning activities for students?

Evidence:

Evidence for D4 can be found in the answer to question 9 in the post-observation conference/interview.

Scoring Rules

D4

0. The teacher demonstrates no awareness of obvious resources provided by colleagues in the school or district, or misapplies such knowledge to his or her own teaching situation or students.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher can identify people who can (and possibly others who cannot) act as a resource to provide teaching insights and who can help to coordinate learning activities for students.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher indicates how he or she interacts with colleagues and other professionals to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students.

5. Above Level 4

D5 **Communicating with families regarding student learning and, where appropriate, interacting effectively with the community**

This criterion focuses on the teacher's contacts with both the families of students and the community at large. The nature of communications with families regarding the school success of their children will vary significantly with age/grade level and the subject being taught. In all cases such communication should be handled in a nonthreatening way that is respectful of the cultural diversity in the community. Communication with the community at large might include (but need not be limited to) incorporating community resources into planned lessons and classroom activities. The teacher should also be knowledgeable about the community and its culture(s). If the teacher does not already have such knowledge, reaching out to families and/or to the community at large can help the teacher acquire it. Even if the teacher has in-depth familiarity with the community, such contacts can provide much that will be of value in teaching.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Can the teacher demonstrate knowledge of how he or she could communicate with families?

2. Does the teacher communicate with families in ways that are appropriate to his or her teaching situation?

3. Is the teacher knowledgeable about the community and its culture(s)?

4. Does the teacher convey an attitude of openness toward the community or toward learning about the community?

Evidence:

Evidence for D5 can be found in answers to questions 10-11 in the post-observation conference/interview.

Scoring Rules

D5

0. The teacher makes no attempt, and is unwilling, to communicate with families or learn about the community or the teacher communicates with families in a disrespectful or offensive manner.

1. Above level 0, but below Level 2

---

2. The teacher identifies one or more strategies that he or she can use to communicate with the families of students in the class. The teacher also indicates that he or she is aware of resources which would enable him/her to learn about students' families and the community in which they live.

3. Above Level 2, but below Level 4

4. The teacher indicates how he or she involves families in student learning. The teacher also indicates how he or she utilizes community resources to promote student learning.

5. Above Level 4

# Appendix F: Criterion Descriptions and Scoring Rules
(Fall 1992 Version)

September 1992

# PRAXIS III: CLASSROOM PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENTS
# ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

## Domain A. Organizing Content Knowledge for Student Learning

Knowledge of the content to be taught underlies all aspects of good instruction. Domain A focuses on how teachers use their understanding of students and subject matter to decide on learning goals; to design or select appropriate activities and instructional materials; to sequence instruction in ways that will help students to meet short- and long-term curricular goals; and to design or select informative evaluation strategies. All of these processes, beginning with the learning goals, must be aligned with each other, and because of the diverse needs represented in any class, each of the processes mentioned must be carried out in ways that take into account the variety of knowledge and experiences that students bring to class. Therefore, knowledge of relevant information about the students themselves is an integral part of this domain.

Domain A is concerned with how the teacher thinks about the content to be taught. This thinking is evident in how the teacher organizes instruction for the benefit of her or his students.

The primary sources of evidence for the criteria in Domain A are the class profile, instruction profile, and preobservation interview. The classroom observation may also contribute to assessing performance on these criteria.

A1: Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences

A2: Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate for the students

A3: Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future

A4: Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson

A5: Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.



133

## A1 Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' background knowledge and experiences

Description:

Research in cognitive science shows that students learn not simply by memorizing facts, but by reconfiguring and reorganizing what they already know. This means that students' experiences, both individual and cultural, are the essential material for learning. Teaching entails building bridges between the content to be learned and students' background knowledge and experiences. Therefore, teachers must become aware of these experiences.

Background knowledge and experiences include students' prior knowledge of the subject, their skills, interests, motivation to learn, developmental levels, and cultural experiences. Gaining information about some of these factors, such as prior knowledge or skills related to the content, may be relatively straightforward; for example, pretesting on the content to be taught can be a useful tool for the teacher. Less formal means, such as classroom discussion or observation of students, can contribute information not only about students' prior knowledge, but also about their interests, motivation, development levels, and cultural resources. Students as individuals differ with respect to any or all of these factors. Culturally, students differ in their beliefs, values, and ways of relating to the world. In classrooms, these cultural differences are manifested in how the students interact with each other and with the teacher, how they use language, how they approach learning tasks, and how they demonstrate what they know, among other things.

"Cultural differences" or "cultural diversity" are broadly defined to include ethnic differences, other differences associated with language group, socioeconomic background, and exceptionalities, as well as gender. To the extent possible, teachers should become familiar with and sensitive to the background experiences of students in these groups in order to build on students' experiences during instruction. However, group membership should never be used as a basis for stereotypical judgments about students.

Although teachers need knowledge of cultural differences, it would be unrealistic and impractical to expect beginning teachers to have a thorough understanding of the numerous cultural groups in our society. They should know, however, various procedures through which they can gain information about those communities that are represented in their classes. These procedures may include making home visits, conferring with community members, talking with parents, consulting with more-experienced colleagues, and observing children in and out of school to discern patterns of behavior that may be related to their cultural backgrounds.

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

The extent to which it is possible for teachers to become familiar with the various aspects of individual students' background knowledge and experiences may be affected by many factors, such as the number of students in the classroom and the amount of time each day that the teacher spends with a particular group. Teachers in self-contained classrooms, for example, may be expected to learn a great deal about their students' backgrounds and experiences. In some situations, such as a schedule and teaching load that assigns hundreds of students to one teacher, the teacher may be able to gain only a general understanding of the backgrounds of the students as a group. Regardless of their teaching assignment, however, all teachers need to know various procedures by which they can become familiar with their students' backgrounds and experiences.

As teachers gain skill, their understanding of the importance of gaining such information should deepen, and their knowledge of appropriate ways of gaining it should broaden.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. How does the teacher find out about students' background knowledge and experiences?

2. How does the teacher find out about students' foundation for understanding of the content?

3. Is the teacher able to describe why it is important to become familiar with students' background knowledge and experiences?

4. Is the teacher's degree of familiarity with students' background knowledge and experiences adequate in relation to the number of students he or she teaches?

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

A1

Scoring Rules

1.0 **The teacher demonstrates a lack of understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background experiences, does not know how to find this information, and lacks familiarity with students' background experiences.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The teacher demonstrates some understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background experiences, describes one procedure used to obtain this information, and has some familiarity with the background knowledge and experiences of students in the class.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **The teacher demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of why it is important to become familiar with students' background experiences, describes several procedures used to obtain this information, and demonstrates a clear understanding of students' background knowledge and experiences.**

3.5 Above level 3.0

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## A2 Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate to the students

Description:

A teacher should be able to translate the content of the lesson into goals for student learning. "Goals" should be understood to mean the desired learning outcomes or objectives for the lesson that will be observed. Goals may be expressed in various formats and terminology. It is critical, however, that goals--what the teacher wants the student to learn--be clearly distinguished from activities--what the teacher wants the students to do.

There are no restrictions to the kinds of learning that can be expressed in learning goals. In many cases, goals may refer to knowledge to be acquired--concepts, facts, and so on. In other situations, goals may address other kinds of learning; these may include, but are not limited to, values, thinking skills, social skills, performance skills, and behavioral goals. Regardless of the kind of goals involved, the teacher should be able to articulate how the students' actions, attitudes, knowledge, and/or skills will be modified or enhanced through their participation in the lesson.

At the basic level, this criterion asks teachers to translate their knowledge of content into goals that are stated as general learning outcomes. As the teacher gains skill, he or she should be able to support the goals by explaining why they are appropriate for this particular group of students and to modify or adjust expected outcomes to meet the needs of individual students in the class. If the teacher has no influence over the learning goals set for the class--for example, because of the specific requirements of a district-determined curriculum--the teacher should be able to explain how, and to what extent, the goals are appropriate for the whole class, or for groups or individual students within the class.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Is the teacher able to state learning goals for the current lesson?
2. Does the teacher state the goals in terms of student outcomes, clearly distinguishing outcomes from activities?
3. Does the teacher give a clear rationale for the stated goals?
4. Does the teacher provide different goals for groups or individual students?
5. Does the teacher provide an acceptable explanation of why the differentiated goals are appropriate for groups or individual students?

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

A2

Scoring Rules

1.0 The teacher does not articulate clear learning goals

OR

the teacher has chosen goals that are inappropriate for the students.

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 The teacher articulates clear learning goals that are appropriate for the students.

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 The teacher articulates clear learning goals and provides a well-thought-out explanation of why they are appropriate for the students

OR

the teacher articulates clear learning goals that are appropriate to the students and are differentiated for groups or individual students in the class.

3.5 Above level 3.0

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

A3 **Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously. the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future**

Description:

This criterion refers to a teacher's understanding of the structure or hierarchy of a discipline and of how knowing one element is prerequisite to or related to learning another. It contains two fundamental ideas. First, the teacher must be able to sequence content across lessons; she or he should be able to explain how the content of the lesson is related to what preceded it and how it is related to what will follow. Second, she or he should be able to draw on knowledge of the subject matter to explain where the current lesson fits within the broader scope of the discipline as a whole. That is, the teacher must be able to explain not only how the content of the lesson fits with what came before and what will follow, but also why this sequence is logical.

If the sequencing of content is outside the teacher's control, the teacher should still be able to identify and explain the connections, as well as the relationships, that this criterion addresses.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Can the teacher explain how the content he or she has planned for today connects to what the students have previously learned?

2. Can the teacher explain how the content he or she has planned for today connects to what the students will study in the future?

3. To what extent can the teacher explain how today's lesson fits with larger goals of learning in the discipline?

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

A3

Scoring Rules

1.0 **The teacher does not explain how the content of this lesson relates to the content of previous or future lessons**

OR

**the explanation given is illogical or inaccurate.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The teacher accurately explains how the content of this lesson relates to the content of previous or future lessons.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **In addition to the requirements for level 2.0, the teacher accurately explains how the content of this lesson fits within the structure of the discipline.**

3.5 Above level 3.0



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

A4 **Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities, and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate to the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson**

Description:

Instructional methods are the various ways in which teachers can structure learning activities. Methods are concerned with what teachers do; activities are concerned with what students do. Learning activities can involve students as a large group, in small groups, or individually. Activities should be designed to foster student involvement and to enhance the learning experience, whether the format is teacher presentation, teacher-led discussion, structured small-group work, peer teaching, programmed instruction, or some other format.

Activities range from teacher-directed through student-initiated. In deciding on teaching methods and selecting or designing learning activities, teachers should consider the learning goals and the preferred participation styles of students in the class. For example, some content is best conveyed through large-group discussion; other content lends itself better to small-group investigation. Similarly, some students may work better individually; others may benefit from cooperative group work. Whether the activities are created by the teacher or selected from those in a textbook or curriculum guide, the teacher should be able to provide a sound rationale for their use.

Instructional materials are concrete resources that students use to learn the content of the lesson. In some situations, no instructional materials are needed. If instructional materials are used, they may support any type of lesson. Materials need not be elaborate or expensive; for example, they may be "found" materials. Teachers should also be able to make use of relevant materials that students bring to class. In addition, the teacher may choose to draw on other resources, such as parents and community institutions. Whatever materials or resources are selected must be appropriate to the students. In a culturally or otherwise diverse classroom, this might require the use of a variety of types of materials.

Methods, activities, materials, and resources must be aligned with each other, and with the goals of the lesson. Activities, materials, and resources must all be developmentally appropriate for the students. At the basic level, this should be true for the students as a group. As teachers gain skill, they should be able to recognize the diverse needs of students and to meet those needs through the use of varied methods, activities and materials; the teacher's decisions should accommodate students in the class who have specific physical, emotional, behavioral or learning differences. For a given lesson, teachers should also gain skill at considering the various teaching methods, activities, materials, and resources, and selecting or creating those that will best meet students' needs.



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Are the methods, activities, materials, and resources selected by the teacher aligned with the goals of the lesson?

2. Are the methods and activities appropriate to the students' developmental levels? Do the materials and activities provide for varied styles of participation?

3. Are the activities, materials, and resources appropriate to the students' developmental levels? Do they reflect the common and unique experiences of different ethnic groups, of males and females, of different economic groups, of groups with exceptionalities? Are the activities, and resources appropriate for students of limited English proficiency?

4. If a single activity is used, can the teacher provide a sound explanation of why a single activity is appropriate for all students?

5. Is there evidence that the teacher has considered various methods, activities, and materials, and has considered the advantages and disadvantages of each?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

A4

Scoring Rules

1.0 **The teacher chooses methods, activities, or materials* that are unrelated to the goals of the lesson**

**OR**

**the methods, activities, or materials* are clearly not appropriate to the students.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The teacher chooses methods, activities, and materials* that are aligned with the goals of the lesson and that are appropriate to the students in general.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **In addition to the requirements for level 2.0, the teacher chooses methods, activities, and materials* that allow a differentiated learning experience for individuals or groups of students**

**OR**

**the teacher provides a sound explanation of why the single teaching method or learning activity in the lesson is appropriate for all students.**

3.5 Above level 3.0

* "Materials" includes all resources that the teacher might use. If the lesson requires no materials, there is no penalty to the teacher for not using them.

143

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

A5 **Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson**

Description:

It is only through well-designed evaluation strategies that a teacher knows whether students have achieved the learning goals for the lesson and is able to plan further learning experiences. Evaluation strategies must be aligned with, and reflect, the goals of the lesson. If the goals relate to individual student learning, then the plan for evaluation should do so, too; if the goals relate to small- or large-group outcomes, as in a performing music group, then the plan for evaluation should also do so.

A plan for evaluation of student learning may include one or more formats. The teacher may create evaluation strategies (for example, teacher-made tests or student portfolios) or select them from the instructional materials used (for example, the chapter test from a textbook). For certain types of goals, tests may be less appropriate than other strategies, such as observation of student performance. Many teachers involve students in self-evaluation or peer evaluation. Whatever the strategy, evaluation must be systematic. That is, it must provide the teacher with useful information about the extent to which the instructional goals--whether individual or group--have been met. As the teacher gains experience, she or he will gain understanding of how the results of the evaluation can be used to help in planning future instruction.

Evaluation strategies must be appropriate for the students. Since the goal of evaluation is to gather information about learning, the strategies chosen should provide students with clear opportunities to demonstrate their learning. In culturally diverse classrooms, student evaluation is especially complex. Children from different groups may enter school with culturally specific understandings of the appropriate ways of displaying knowledge. If the teacher and students do not share these understandings, the teacher may misjudge the students' competence unless he or she is sensitive to these cultural differences. Because reliance on a single form of evaluation may place some students at a disadvantage, teachers may need to use a variety of strategies to evaluate student learning. This is especially relevant for students of limited English proficiency and for many students with exceptionalities.

Evaluation strategies may be implemented at a time later than the observed lesson. While some monitoring of student learning occurs in class on a daily basis, most systematic evaluation is separated in time from instruction. The nature of the lesson and the unit will determine not only the form, but also the timing of evaluation. In many cases, evaluation of the lesson being assessed may be part of the evaluation of a longer unit of instruction.

A critical element of this criterion is that the strategy or plan is designed to provide information about how well the learning goals of this lesson have been met. In most cases, the assessor will not see the evaluation strategies being implemented; however, the teacher must provide oral or written evidence of a plan for the evaluation of learning goals.

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. How is the plan for evaluation aligned with the learning goals of the lesson?

2. Is the plan for evaluation sufficiently systematic to provide the teacher with useful information about the extent to which learning goals have been met?

3. Is the evaluation appropriate to the students in the class? What methods are used? How are students of limited English proficiency and students with exceptionalities provided with opportunities to display their knowledge of content?

4. Can the teacher describe how he or she will use the results of the evaluation in planning future instruction?

A5

Scoring Rules

**1.0 The teacher has not provided for systematically evaluating student learning**

**OR**

**the evaluation planned is clearly inappropriate either to the goals of the lesson or to the students.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

**2.0 The teacher has a plan for systematically evaluating student learning that is aligned with the goals of the lesson and appropriate to the students.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

**3.0 In addition to the requirements for level 2.0, the teacher can describe how he or she will use the results of the evaluation in planning future instruction.**

3.5 Above level 3.0

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Domain B: Creating an Environment for Student Learning

Domain B relates to the social and emotional components of learning as prerequisites to academic achievement. Thus, most of the criteria in this domain focus on the human interactions in the classroom, on the connections between teachers and students, and among students. Domain B addresses issues of fairness and rapport, of helping students to believe that they can learn and can meet challenges, of establishing and maintaining constructive standards for behavior in the classroom. It also includes the learning "environment" in the most literal sense -- the physical setting in which teaching and learning take place.

A learning environment that provides both emotional and physical safety for students is one in which a broad range of teaching and learning experiences can occur. Teachers must be able to use their knowledge of their students in order to interpret their students' behavior accurately and respond in ways that are appropriate and supportive. When they do so, their interactions with students consistently foster the students' sense of self-esteem. In addition, teachers' efforts to establish a sense of the classroom as a community with clear standards should never be arbitrary; all behavioral standards and teacher-student interactions should be grounded in a sense of respect for students as individuals.

Evidence for the criteria in Domain B will be drawn primarily from the classroom observation; supporting evidence may be drawn from both the pre- and postobservation interviews. The class profile provides contextual information relevant to these criteria.

B1: Creating a climate that promotes fairness

B2: Establishing and maintaining rapport with students

B3: Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student

B4: Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior

B5: Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## B1 Creating a climate that promotes fairness

Description:

This criterion is concerned with the teacher's ability to facilitate and maintain fair classroom interactions between the teacher and the students and among students. "Fairness" here means helping all students to have access to learning and to feel that they are equally valued in the classroom. In this sense, promoting fairness also implies promoting a sense of self-worth for each student. The teacher should consistently provide good examples of fairness. At the same time, fair treatment should not be interpreted to mean a formulaic, rigid, or stereotype-based way of "treating all students the same."

The teacher must be fair in the treatment of students of different genders, ethnicity, cultural backgrounds, and socioeconomic levels, as well as those with exceptionalities. The teacher should be familiar with and value the diverse ways in which students express themselves and interact with one another. Examples of unfair teacher behavior include giving praise to high achievers only, "playing favorites," allowing particular individuals or groups of students to be consistently off-task without trying to reengage them in the activity, asking or allowing only some students to respond to questions, making comments about students that are demeaning, and stereotyping. In contrast, to create a climate that promotes fairness, the teacher should convey and act on the attitude that all students are important, and that they all have a right to learning opportunities and attention. The teacher should not accept without a response comments and interactions by students with each other or with the teacher that are demeaning, based on stereotypes, or otherwise unfair.

As the teacher gains skill, she or he should be able to help students develop a sense of fairness--what it means and how it takes shape--in their interactions with each other.

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Is the teacher fair in interactions with students during the observed class period?

2. In what ways does the teacher help students to have access to learning?

3. In what ways does the teacher help the students feel equally valued in the classroom?

4. Are there patterns of either exclusion or overattention in student-teacher interactions?

5. Does the teacher show evidence of stereotyped views of students?

6. Is the teacher inappropriately negative in remarks to students?

7. Do students treat each other fairly?

8. Does the teacher respond appropriately to stereotype-based, demeaning, or other unfair comments by students?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

B1

Scoring Rules

**1.0 The teacher is unfair in the treatment of students**

**OR**

**the teacher tolerates obviously unfair behavior among students.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

**2.0 The teacher is fair in the treatment of students and does not accept obviously unfair behavior among students.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

**3.0 The teacher is fair in the treatment of students and actively encourages fairness among students.**

3.5 Above level 3.0

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## B2 Establishing and maintaining rapport with students

Description:

This criterion is concerned with the teacher's ability to relate positively to students as people. The teacher might demonstrate traits such as genuine concern, warmth, sincerity, and humor. Additional ways of establishing rapport include exhibiting interest in students as unique individuals, acknowledging the traditions and customs of students with differing ethnic backgrounds, and taking time to listen to students. Effective interpersonal and communication skills also contribute to establishing rapport. Comments that indicate, either directly or indirectly, an understanding of students' lives outside of school also provide evidence of rapport. Other indicators of rapport can include making eye contact, smiling, making focused comments or a friendly joke, maintaining appropriate proximity to students, and so on.

Rapport can appear in a wide range of forms. Students' developmental levels will have a significant impact on what constitutes appropriate attempts to establish rapport. For example, some kinds of physical contact may be appropriate with young children, but inappropriate with older students. In addition, teachers, like students, are diverse; there is no single "right way" to achieve rapport. Because teacher-student rapport can be manifested in so many different ways, the assessor must be careful to consider rapport in specific rather than general terms; is the teacher's attempt to establish or maintain rapport appropriate, given the context in which the teacher is working? For example, a comment by a teacher might be interpreted as undesirably sarcastic in one context, but as supportive in another. In such a situation, the assessor must consider the students' reactions, or ask about the interaction in the post-observation interview.

As the teacher gains skill, he or she should be able to build on a basis of understanding students and should have a better sense of what is appropriate and likely to work with students.

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher attempt to relate positively to students?

2. Does the teacher show concern for the students?

3. Does the teacher tailor personal interactions according to the individual characteristics of students?

4. Do the teacher's attempt to establish rapport take into account the students' backgrounds and experiences?

5. Are the teacher's attempts to establish rapport appropriate to the students' developmental levels?

B2

Scoring Rules

1.0 The teacher does not attempt to establish rapport with students

OR

the teacher's attempts are inappropriate.

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 The teacher establishes a basic level of rapport with the students.

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 The teacher successfully establishes rapport in ways that are appropriate to students' diverse backgrounds and needs.

3.5 Above level 3.0

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

## B3 Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student

Description:

The teacher must convey the attitude that school is a place for learning and that all students can learn. The teacher should communicate explicitly or implicitly a belief that each student is capable of significant achievement. For example, the teacher might select learning goals that are rigorous or challenging for the students, but within their reach, and combine this with encouragement for students to have confidence, to take risks, and in general to strive for success.

Given the likelihood that students in the class will have varying levels of skills, abilities, and achievements, the challenging expectations for each student may--in absolute terms--be somewhat different. A reciprocal relationship frequently exists between expectations and performance. Other things being equal, students may put forth more effort, with greater energy, if they believe that their teacher anticipates that they will perform well. As a result of this effort and energy, students' work frequently meets a high standard, enhancing the students' capabilities in the eyes of the teacher, and encouraging the teacher to hold high standards for future work.

This criterion includes two distinct, though related, ideas. First, a teacher's confidence in students can help them "stretch," tackling challenging tasks or understanding difficult concepts. Second, a teacher's high standards for students can encourage them to produce work of high quality, completed with conscientious attention, that becomes a source of pride for the students. As the teacher gains skill, he or she should be able to draw on familiarity with students' background knowledge and experiences to communicate challenging expectations that are suitable for individual students or groups of students.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. How does the teacher show, by words, actions, or attitude, that each student is capable of meaningful achievement?

2. In what ways do the students demonstrate a clear understanding of the teacher's expectations for achievement that may have been stated explicitly prior to the observation?

3. Are the learning expectations for students challenging but within their reach?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

B3

Scoring Rules

1.0 **The teacher communicates explicitly or implicitly to individuals, to groups within the class, or to the class as a whole that they are incapable of learning or that the teacher's expectations for their learning are very low.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The teacher does nothing to communicate to any student that he or she is incapable of meeting learning expectations.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **The teacher actively encourages students to meet challenging learning expectations.**

3.5 Above level 3.0

153

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## B4 Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior

Description:

This criterion refers to the desired standards of teacher and student interaction that will ensure an appropriate climate for learning. Both students and teacher may contribute to the development of standards for appropriate classroom behavior. The exact nature of such standards may vary widely, in response to students' developmental levels, their cultural backgrounds, the subject being taught, the model of teaching that is implemented, the level of noise or informality that the teacher is comfortable with, and so on. Once established and agreed on, these standards must be maintained consistently, although there will of course be situations that require "exceptions to the rule."

It is not expected that all students will behave at all times in accordance with the behavioral standards for the class. Students as individuals obviously differ widely in their attitudes and their willingness to accept behavioral standards; in addition, classes, as groups, have their own "personalities." In all cases, it is important for the teacher both to demonstrate positive behavior and to make sure that students understand the consequences for breaches of the agreed-on standards of behavior. At the basic level, teachers may have trouble anticipating potentially disruptive behavior and may, therefore, have to respond frequently to major disruptions (that is, behavior that constitutes a serious breach of the standards for the class). As the teacher gains skill she or he should be able to move to a level of skill that enables her or him to handle the range of behavior issues more consistently and effectively and to anticipate misbehavior.

The assessor should not expect to see the teacher actively establishing standards for behavior during every lesson that is observed; in many cases, the students' behavior may enable the assessor to infer that standards have been established and maintained. In evaluating how standards of behavior have been established, implemented, and maintained, it is also important to keep in mind that there is a range of standards for behavior that can contribute to a range of positive learning environments. There is no single right way to keep order. In all cases, however, the standards must embody a sense of respect for students as people.

If there are school policies that affect standards of classroom behavior, the assessor should be aware of them and of the rationale for them.



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Are consistent standards of classroom behavior evident?
2. How are standards established?
3. Does the teacher model respectful and appropriate standards of behavior?
4. Do established standards of behavior convey a sense of respect for the students?
5. How are the standards maintained?
6. How does the teacher respond to serious behavior problems? Are her or his responses appropriate?
7. Does the teacher respond to inappropriate behavior consistently and appropriately?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

B4

Scoring Rules

1.0 The teacher makes no attempt to respond to disruptive behavior

OR

the teacher's response to disruptive behavior does not demonstrate respect for the students.

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 The teacher makes appropriate attempts to respond to disruptive behavior in ways that demonstrate respect for the students

OR

there is no disruptive behavior during the lesson.

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 In addition to the requirements for level 2.0, the teacher responds to minor misbehavior consistently and with reasonable success, in ways that demonstrate respect for students

OR

student behavior during the lesson is consistently appropriate.

3.5 Above level 3.0



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

## B5 Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible

Description:

This criterion focuses on the physical setting in which learning is to take place--the degree of harmony or match between the arrangement of the physical environment and the planned lesson or activity. Student safety and students' diverse physical needs also fall within the realm of this criterion.

In assessing this criterion, it is essential to consider the degree of control that the teacher has over the physical environment. For example, if the furniture is securely anchored to the floor or if the teacher moves from classroom to classroom, serious limitations are placed on the teacher's opportunities to demonstrate effective use of space.

When the teacher does have control of the learning space, the assessor's attention should focus on the effect that the physical arrangements have on learning. In some situations, such as lab sciences, vocational education, or home economics, it is especially important for the arrangement to reflect a concern for students' safety. In addition, the room should be organized so that all students, including those with special needs, have access to instruction. If the teacher has no control over the physical environment, attention should be given to how the teacher adjusts the lesson or activity to the setting, despite this drawback. As the teacher gains skill he or she is able to use the physical space as a resource that facilitates learning--that is, the physical space becomes an element that contributes to the effectiveness of instruction. For example, a French or ESL teacher might label the door, windows, shelves, and other objects in the classroom in the language being taught. In a primary-grade classroom, the teacher might take care to position bulletin-board displays and other visual materials at the children's eye level.

Another factor to consider in this criterion is the affective dimension of the physical setting. The presence or absence of displays of student work, the level of diversity evident in displays, the attractiveness of the space, and the degree of overall appeal as a place for learning are variables in this aspect of the criterion. Though such characteristics may be highly variable according to context and relatively difficult to judge, they are part of the decision concerning "conducive to learning" included here.

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. How much control does the teacher have over the physical environment?

2. Are any safety violations or risks evident?

3. To what extent is there a match between the lesson or activity and the furniture or room configuration?

4. Is the space arranged so that all students, including those with special needs, have access to the lesson?

5. How does the room reflect the learning that takes place there?

B5

Scoring Rules

1.0 The teacher allows the physical environment to be unsafe

OR

the teacher allows the physical environment to interfere with learning.

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 The teacher creates a physical environment that is safe and does not interfere with learning.

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 The teacher uses the physical environment as a resource to facilitate learning. Provisions are made to accommodate all students, including those with special needs. If the teacher does not control the physical environment, he or she effectively adjusts the activities to the existing physical environment.

3.5 Above level 3.0

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Domain C: Teaching for student learning

This domain focuses on the act of teaching and its overall goal: helping students to connect with the content. As used here, "content" refers to the subject matter of a discipline and may include knowledge, skills, perceptions and values in any domain: cognitive, social, artistic, physical and so on. Teachers direct students in the process of establishing individual connections with the content, thereby devising a good "fit" for the content within the framework of the students' knowledge, interests, abilities, cultural backgrounds and personal backgrounds. At the same time, teachers should help students to move beyond the limits of their current knowledge or understanding. Teachers monitor learning, making certain that students assimilate information accurately and that they understand and can apply what they have learned. Teachers must also be sure that students understand what is expected of them procedurally during the lesson and that class time is used to good purpose.

Most of the evidence for a teacher's performance with respect to these criteria will come from the classroom observation. It may be augmented or illuminated by evidence from the pre and postobservation interviews.

C1: Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students

C2: Making content comprehensible to students

C3: Encouraging students to extend their thinking

C4: Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands

C5: Using instructional time effectively



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

## C1 Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students

Description:

This criterion relates to clear communication of both the learning goals for the specific lesson and the instructional procedures that will be used to attain these goals. There are many ways of communicating learning goals to the students. Sometimes the teacher will make the learning goals explicit for the students at the beginning of the lesson, either orally or in writing. This explicit approach is usually used in direct instruction. At other times, the teacher will wait until the end of the lesson, then help the students to infer the learning goals. This implicit approach is often used in inquiry or discovery lessons. Regardless of the instructional strategy used by the teacher, whether direct or indirect, the students should understand that instruction is purposeful.

Students also need to understand the instructional procedures for the lesson--that is, how they are expected to participate in learning activities. Teachers can communicate instructional procedures in a variety of ways that may include, but are not limited to, oral or written directions, explanations or review of the tasks at hand, written contracts with individual students. All instructions or directions given to students about learning activities should be clear, regardless of the specific focus--e.g., completing a worksheet, performing a complex experiment, creating a work of art, cooperating in a group project. In addition, if an out-of-class assignment is given to students, the procedures for carrying out the assignment should be clear.

As the teacher gains experience, he or she should communicate to students, either implicitly or explicitly, how the instructional procedures for the lesson are related to the learning goals.



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher communicate learning goals to the students, either explicitly or implicitly?

2. Are the directions to students for instructional procedures clear?

3. How does the teacher help students of different backgrounds (ethnic groups, language groups, males and females, students with exceptionalities) understand the learning goals of the lesson?

4. How does the teacher help students of different backgrounds (ethnic groups, language groups, males and females, students with exceptionalities) understand the instructional procedures used in the lesson?

5. Are the students able to carry out the instructional procedures?

C1

Scoring Rules

1.0 The teacher provides the students with no information, confusing information, or inaccurate information about the learning goals or the instructional procedures for the lesson.

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 The students receive accurate information about the learning goals. The teacher provides the students with clear, accurate information about the instructional procedures for the lesson, and most of the students seem to understand.

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 In addition to the requirements for Level 2.0, the students seem to understand the learning goals fully. The teacher ensures that all students, including those who may initially have trouble, understand and can carry out the instructional procedures for the lesson.

3.5 Above level 3.0

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

## C2 Making content comprehensible to students

Description:

This criterion focuses on how the teacher's understanding and organization of content--central issues of Domain A--come to life in the classroom. When the teacher is able to make an effective transition from thinking about content to involving students with it, the content is comprehensible to students; that is, students are able to learn by connecting the new content being taught with what is already familiar to them.

In order to learn, students must be engaged with the content and the content must be meaningful to them on some level, whether that level is deeply personal or more purely academic. Therefore, one aspect of this criterion is the teacher's skill at activating and building on students' background knowledge and experiences in order to make the content meaningful to them. The content being taught and the particular situation will, of course, influence how the teacher goes about this. For example, reviews of the content may help students to activate relevant knowledge. Questions or discussions that draw on students' experiences outside of school may enable them to draw on less-academic knowledge that will help them to become engaged with and understand the content of the lesson. Such strategies provide opportunities to help students of diverse background or needs make connections with the content and become engaged with learning. Because student engagement is not likely to occur if the content is incomprehensible, engagement can, in many situations, serve as sound evidence that the students understand the content. However, it is essential to recognize that engagement should involve genuine processing of content, not merely looking busy or becoming involved in activities that are irrelevant to the learning goals.

The teacher should be able to organize instruction through a variety of approaches, such as presentations, small-group or individual work, and student-initiated projects. Such approaches may be used in direct instruction by the teacher or be incorporated into lessons in which students have more control over the learning environment. When the teacher is communicating content directly, it must be clear and accurate and the teacher should use his or her content knowledge in developing explanations, descriptions, examples, analogies, metaphors, demonstrations, discussions, and learning activities that build bridges to the students' background knowledge and experience. If the teacher uses a relatively nondirective approach (e.g., an inquiry lesson) that allows the students more control over the learning experience, the process or structure of the lesson should itself contribute to making content comprehensible.



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

As teachers gain skill, they should be able to structure a lesson in such a way that it is understood not only as a series of discrete pieces of information, but as a group or series of interrelated ideas or processes. For this to occur, the structure of the lesson itself must be coherent; that is, the parts of the lesson must be sequenced logically, so that students can readily follow the lesson's progression. The order of activities makes sense conceptually, and the lesson seems to flow. When a lesson is coherent, its structure actually helps students to understand the content.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher communicate content clearly and accurately? Is this done equitably for females and males, students of different ethnic groups, students of different economic groups, students with exceptionalities, students of limited English proficiency?

2. In lessons that are not teacher-directed, has the teacher structured the learning environment or process in a way that enables students to understand the content?

3. Are students generally engaged with the content?

4. Does the lesson as a whole have a coherent structure?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

C2

Scoring Rules

1.0 The content appears to be incomprehensible to the students

OR

the lesson contains substantive inaccuracies.

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 The content is accurate and appears to be comprehensible to the students.

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 In addition to the requirements for Level 2.0, the lesson as a whole has a logical and coherent structure.

3.5 Above level 3.0



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

## C3 Encouraging students to extend their thinking

Description:

This criterion focuses on the aspects of teaching in any situation that encourage students to develop and have confidence in their own ability to think independently, creatively, or critically. The term "thinking" is used broadly here, and "extending their thinking" does not necessarily imply elaborate exercises, or activities that are foreign to the subject being taught.

Sometimes students do learn content through simple, low-level cognitive processes, for example, by memorizing vocabulary in other languages or procedures for a mathematical operation. More frequently, however, teachers enable students to move beyond the "facts" and extend their thinking, for example, by having them make connections between different events, predict the outcome of a story, or invent another method of solving a problem.

Teachers use many instructional techniques to encourage students to extend their thinking--for example, asking open-ended questions, allowing students adequate time to think about their answers to questions, or assigning tasks in which there is more than one method of completing the task. Through all these strategies, the teacher invites students to extend their thinking.

Nontraditional subject areas also provide opportunities for extending thinking. Solving problems creatively requires thinking, whether the subject area is science, visual art, home economics, shop, or any other area. When the content being studied involves primarily physical skills, extending thinking may become a matter of helping students to recognize the possibilities inherent in skills learned, to integrate skills, or to consider the strategic possibilities in their choice of skills. Similarly, in performance classes, such as drama, extending thinking may involve helping students to integrate performance skills or to understand the relationships between skills or techniques and the performance as a whole.

Many opportunities for students to extend their thinking arise spontaneously in teaching, as when the teacher asks students for their opinions or for alternative explanations. As teachers gain skill, they frequently design an activity or a lesson specifically to encourage students to extend their thinking, as when students are asked to write an essay comparing one author to another, or to consider questions such as why leaves turn brown in the fall, or to offer constructive criticisms of their own or each other's work or performance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher recognize and use opportunities to help students extend their thinking?

2. Is the teacher able to use the current content appropriately as a springboard to independent, creative, or critical thinking?

3. Does the teacher challenge students' thinking in ways relevant to their background knowledge and experiences?

4. Does the teacher structure specific learning activities that encourage students to extend their thinking?

C3

Scoring Rules

**1.0 The teacher discourages students from thinking independently, creatively, or critically.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

**2.0 The teacher encourages students to think independently, creatively, or critically in the context of the content being studied.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

**3.0 The teacher uses activities or strategies that are specifically designed to actively encourage students to think independently, creatively, or critically about the content being taught.**

3.5 Above level 3.0



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

**C4 Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands**

Description:

This criterion refers to the monitoring, feedback, and adjustment that takes place during the lesson. The teacher should monitor the students' understanding of the content throughout the lesson. Monitoring may be accomplished by a variety of means--checking written work, asking questions, paying attention to nonverbal cues from students, and so on. In some specialized situations (e.g., large choir rehearsal), it may be appropriate to monitor groups (e.g., altos) rather than individual students.

In a culturally diverse classroom, especially one that includes students of limited English proficiency, the teacher must be especially sensitive to the verbal and nonverbal signals that each student might use to indicate that he or she is confused or does not understand what is expected. This may require insight into culturally specific ways of expressing understanding and confusion. For example, silence may denote comprehension in one group, but confusion in another.

The teacher should provide specific feedback to reinforce those who are on track and redirect or assist those who need extra help. Feedback can take the form of specific comments to individuals or remarks to groups of students, or it can be nonverbal. Depending how instruction is organized, feedback can come from sources other than the teacher, such as other students, books, self-checking materials, or the activity itself.

The teacher should use information gained from monitoring students' understanding to assess the effectiveness of the particular instructional approach. As the teacher gains skill, he or she should be able to adjust the learning activities as necessary if they are not working as intended or if the students are having unexpected problems. In addition, the teacher may choose to adjust instruction not because of problems, but because he or she recognizes a "teachable moment" and adjusts instruction in order to capitalize on it.

Monitoring, feedback, and adjustment must take into account all of the students in the class. If a group of students is consistently disregarded, or if a group receives the majority of the teacher's attention and the teacher can give no sound reason for this, then monitoring, feedback, and adjustment are not adequate. In some cases monitoring may be difficult to observe directly; in such cases feedback to students or adjustment of the lesson can serve as evidence that monitoring has occurred.

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher monitor students' understanding of the content? Is this done equitably?

2. Does the teacher provide substantive feedback to students? Is this done equitably?

3. Does the teacher adjust learning activities as needed? Is the adjustment equitable?

C4

Scoring Rules

1.0 **The teacher makes no attempt to determine whether students are understanding and gives them no feedback.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The teacher monitors the students' understanding of the content. The students receive feedback as necessary.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **The teacher monitors individual students' or groups of students' understanding of the content and makes appropriate instructional adjustments if necessary. If appropriate, students receive substantive and specific feedback.**

3.5 Above level 3.0



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## C5 Using instructional time effectively

Description:

This criterion refers to the teacher's skill in using time effectively during the lesson. As used here, "instructional" time means time during which content-related teaching and learning take place. "Noninstructional" time, on the other hand, is time spent on activities that are a necessary part of classroom life, but don't contribute to learning.

An important aspect of using time effectively, is pacing the lesson in ways that are appropriate to the students in the class. In well-paced instruction, the amount of time spent on learning activities is appropriate to the content, the learners, and the situation. If the pace of instruction is too fast, some or all of the students may not be able to understand the content being taught. When lessons are paced too slowly, students may become bored and student engagement may decline. Digressions from the planned activities do not constitute a waste of time if they result in valuable learning; digressions that simply wander into irrelevant topics for substantial periods of time should be avoided. If a lesson or learning activity is completed more quickly than the teacher anticipated, he or she should provide the students with meaningful and relevant work or activities for the remaining instructional time.

Using time effectively also implies making sure that time spent on necessary but noninstructional processes is minimized. Therefore, effective classroom routines and procedures for such noninstructional processes as taking roll and distributing materials contribute positive evidence for this criterion, since they enable the teacher to spend more class time on learning activities. As the teacher gains skill, her or his sense of appropriate pacing should become more accurate, and the efficiency with which noninstructional routines are conducted should increase. Time should not be considered wasted if the reasons for the problem (for example, a lengthy interruption via a PA system) are outside the teacher's control.

Questions for assessor reflection:

1. Is the instruction paced in such a way that students appear to be on task most of the time?

2. Is there evidence of established routines and procedures that help the teacher maximize the time available for instruction?

3. If a noninstructional interruption occurs, is instruction resumed efficiently?

4. Do all students have meaningful work or activities for the entire instructional time?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

C5

Scoring Rules

1.0 **Substantial amounts of instructional time are spent on activities of little instructional value**

OR

**the pacing of the lesson is inappropriate to the content and/or the students.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The pacing of the lesson is appropriate for most of the students. Noninstructional procedural matters do not occupy an excessive amount of time.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **The teacher provides students with activities of instructional value for the entire instructional time and paces them appropriately. Any necessary noninstructional procedures are performed efficiently.**

3.5 Above level 3.0



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

DOMAIN D: Teacher Professionalism

Teachers must be able to evaluate their own instructional effectiveness in order to plan specific future lessons for particular classes and to improve their teaching over time. They should be able to discuss the degree to which different aspects of a lesson were successful in terms of instructional approaches, student responses, and learning outcomes. Teachers should be able to explain how they will proceed to work toward learning for all students. The professional responsibilities of all teachers, including beginning teachers, also include sharing appropriate information with other professionals and with families in ways that support the learning of diverse student populations.

The primary source of evidence for the criteria in Domain D is the postobservation interview.

D1: Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met

D2: Demonstrating a sense of efficacy

D3: Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students

D4: Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

D1 **Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met**

Description:

Teaching extends far beyond interaction with students in the classroom, and includes reflection both before and after classroom instruction. Teachers must be able to reflect on classroom events, both in order to plan next steps for individuals or groups of students and in order to improve their teaching skills over time. Toward these ends, this criterion focuses on the teacher's skill in determining the extent to which the students in the class achieved the learning goals. In order to plan the next lessons for this group of students, the teacher must know the extent to which individuals and groups of students achieved the goals for this lesson. For example, if a certain group did not understand a concept, the teacher must know and be prepared with a plan--to be implemented subsequently--to remedy the situation.

In addition, teachers must be able to analyze their teaching of a lesson in terms of both successes and areas needing improvement. Many lessons--particularly those being taught for the first time--do not proceed exactly as planned. By consciously reflecting on these lessons and analyzing their strong and weak features, teachers are able to learn from their experiences and improve their skills.

In stating what they plan to do subsequently with a group of students, based on what occurred in the observed lesson, teachers provide evidence of their skill in using the results from one lesson to plan for the future. By describing how they might teach the same lesson again, teachers demonstrate their skill in constructively critiquing their own performance. As teachers gain skill in reflection, they can support their judgments with references to specific events in the classroom. If the lesson had more than one goal, the teacher may be able to discuss in comparative terms the degree to which the students as a group achieved the various goals. They may also be able to make and support judgments with respect to the learning of particular individuals or groups of students.



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. What judgments does the teacher make about the extent to which the goals were met? Are these judgments accurate?

2. How does the teacher support her or his judgment?

3. What explanation does the teacher give for deviations from the instructional plan?

4. How does the teacher analyze the effectiveness of her or his teaching strategies?

5. How does the teacher articulate ways in which insights gained from this lesson could be used to improve future instruction?

D1

Scoring Rules

1.0 **The teacher cannot accurately identify strengths and weaknesses of the lesson in relation to the learning goals.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The teacher accurately describes the strengths and weaknesses of the lesson in relation to the learning goals and describes in general terms how he or she could use the experience from this lesson in future instruction.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **In addition to the requirements for level 2.0, the teacher supports his or her judgments with specific evidence from the observed lesson.**

3.5 Above level 3.0



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

## D2 Demonstrating a sense of efficacy

Description:

A teacher who has a sense of efficacy attributes the degree of students' success in meeting learning goals to factors within the classroom rather than to factors outside it. This criterion focuses on the ways in which teachers demonstrate and act on that belief.

Teachers with a high degree of efficacy regard student difficulties in learning as challenges to their own creativity and ingenuity. They actively search for better techniques to help students learn. Thus, a teacher with a high degree of efficacy is not expected to know all the answers to reaching every student, but he or she will persist in looking for alternatives. On the other hand, teachers with little sense of efficacy tend to use factors such as the school administration, excessive television viewing, students' families, or the students themselves as excuses for not persisting in efforts to help students learn.

Teachers with a high sense of efficacy are not expected to have a complete plan to deal with every student's difficulties in learning, particularly immediately after an observed lesson. However, these teachers are prepared with several possible actions, and convey a sense of commitment to persisting in the search for an effective approach so every student can meet the learning goals.

As teachers gain skill in this area, they become more resourceful and their repertoire of possible approaches or actions to try broadens.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. In what ways does the teacher convey a sense of efficacy with respect to students' learning?

2. What specific actions does the teacher suggest for working with individual students who are not meeting the learning goals?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

D2

Scoring Rules

1.0 **The teacher makes no attempt to find ways to help students who are not meeting the learning goals.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The teacher attempts to find ways to help specific students who are not meeting the learning goals, but cannot suggest any specific, practical actions that he or she has not already tried.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **The teacher suggests specific, practical actions that he or she intends to take to help specific students who are not meeting the learning goals.**

3.5 Above level 3.0



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## D3 Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and to coordinate learning activities for students

Description:

This criterion focuses on two distinct, though related, aspects of a teacher's professional relationships with colleagues. The first of these is seeking help from other professionals on matters related to learning and instruction or to other concerns related to teaching. For example, the teacher should know who in the school is experienced in working with students of the same level or in the same subject area, and should be aware of other people in the school or district who can help the teacher improve his or her instructional skills. The teacher should also be aware of others--for example, librarians or specialist teachers--who can provide assistance with curricular materials or other resources to enrich the learning experience for students.

Secondly, the teacher should be aware of how, and with whom, he or she could or should coordinate plans, schedules, and resources for the benefit of the entire class or individual students. As teachers gain skill, they are able to collaborate effectively with colleagues. Examples of such collaboration might include working with other teachers to design integrated lessons or units, coordinating plans with specialists such as ESL teachers, and maintaining close contact with special education teachers for mainstreamed students, and so on. Teachers who team-teach should demonstrate knowledge of how to coordinate activities with colleagues other than the team-teaching partner.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher identify colleagues within the school who can provide instructional help that is relevant to the observed lesson or to students in the class?

2. If appropriate, does the teacher identify colleagues whose participation is either necessary or helpful in coordinating learning activities for students?

3. Does the teacher consult with colleagues on matters related to learning and instruction or other professional matters?

4. In what ways does the teacher collaborate with colleagues outside his or her classroom to coordinate learning activities or address other teaching concerns?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

D3

Scoring Rules

1.0 **The teacher demonstrates no knowledge of resources available through colleagues in the school or district**

**OR**

**the teacher is aware of such resources, but does not attempt to use them, despite an obvious need.**

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 **The teacher demonstrates knowledge of resources and attempts to consult with colleagues when necessary on matters related to learning and instruction.**

2.5 Above level 2.0, but below level 3.0

3.0 **In addition to the requirements for level 2.0, the teacher collaborates with colleagues outside of his or her own classroom to coordinate learning activities or to address other concerns related to teaching.**

3.5 Above level 3.0

177

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

## D4 Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning

Description:

This criterion focuses on the teacher's contacts with the parents or guardians of students. The nature of communications with parents or guardians regarding the school success of their children will vary significantly with age or grade level and the subject being taught. Potential forms of communication might include, for example, scheduled conferences with parents, telephone calls or written notes about positive events as well as individual students' problems, or class newsletters. For teachers who have instructional contact with large numbers of students, the realistic possibilities will be somewhat more limited than for teachers in self-contained classrooms. Even undifferentiated means of communication--for example, notification of special events such as plays, exhibitions, sports events--can constitute communication with students' parents or guardians.

In all cases, such communication should be handled in a nonthreatening way that is respectful of the cultural diversity in the community. For example, teachers should be sensitive to the effects that a call to a parent at work could have, and should be aware of whether communication exclusively in English is reasonable.

As teachers gain skill, their familiarity with forms of communication should broaden, and they should become more knowledge about which forms are likely to be effective in a particular situation.

Questions for Assessor Reflection:

1. Does the teacher demonstrate knowledge of how he or she could communicate with parents or guardians?

2. Does the teacher communicate appropriately with parents or guardians in ways that are suitable for his or her teaching situation?



©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

D4

Scoring Rules

1.0 The teacher demonstrates no knowledge of forms of communication that she or he can use to communicate with parents or guardians

OR

the teacher makes no attempt to communicate with parents or guardians, even when it is clearly necessary to do so.

1.5 Above level 1.0, but below level 2.0

2.0 The teacher demonstrates knowledge of forms of communication that she or he can use to communicate with parents or guardians of students for various purposes.

2.5 Above level 2.0, below level 3.0

3.0 In addition to the requirements for level 2.0, the teacher describes situations in which she or he has communicated or would communicate with parents or guardians regarding specific students and indicates the forms of communication she or he has used or would use.

3.5 Above level 3.0

©1992 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks to Educational Testing Service.

# Appendix G: Instruments/Forms Used in Praxis III
(Fall 1991 Version)

Date of Revision: September 24, 1991

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers®

Document #_____

# ASSESSOR PROFILE

Assessor's SS# (optional)_____Assessor's ID#_____

The information that you provide is completely confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Please answer the questions by putting a check next to the choice that most closely describes you or your professional activities based on a typical school-year schedule. Unless otherwise indicated, please check only one response for each question. Please respond to all questions.

1. Which of the following best describes the area in which you work?

[ ] 1. Low income, urban
[ ] 2. Middle or upper income, urban
[ ] 3. Suburban
[ ] 4. Small town (not suburban)
[ ] 5. Rural
[ ] 6. Other (Please specify)_____

2. What is your age?

[ ] 1. Under 25
[ ] 2. 25 - 34
[ ] 3. 35 - 44
[ ] 4. 45 - 54
[ ] 5. 55 - 64
[ ] 6. 65 and over

3. What is your gender?

[ ] 1. Female [ ] 2. Male

4. How would you describe yourself?

[ ] 1. African American or Black
[ ] 2. Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander
[ ] 3. Mexican American or Chicano
[ ] 4. Native American, Inuit, or Aleut
[ ] 5. Puerto Rican
[ ] 6. Other Hispanic
[ ] 7. White
[ ] 8. Other (please specify)_____

©1991 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Teting Service.
The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

5. What is the highest degree you hold?

[ ] 1. Less than a Bachelor's
[ ] 2. Bachelor's
[ ] 3. Master's or equivalent
[ ] 4. Master's and additional coursework
[ ] 5. Doctorate

6. Please provide the following information regarding your academic background. (Check and complete ALL that apply.)

1. Did you go through an alternate route teacher certification program?
[ ] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No

2. Bachelor's degree
[ ] 1. In progress [ ] 2. Completed [ ] 3. Not applicable

Major (please specify)_____

Minor (please specify)_____

3. Master's degree or equivalent
[ ] 1. In progress [ ] 2. Completed [ ] 3. Not applicable

Major field (please specify)_____

4. Doctorate or equivalent
[ ] 1. In progress [ ] 2. Completed [ ] 3. Not applicable

Major field (please specify)_____

7. Which of the following best describes your current status?

[ ] 1. Emergency/temporary license
[ ] 2. Regular teacher, classroom (certified, not a substitute)
[ ] 3. Regular teacher, special assignment
[ ] 4. Principal or assistant principal
[ ] 5. School administrator, other than principal or assistant principal
[ ] 6. Supervisor
[ ] 7. State administrator
[ ] 8. College faculty
[ ] 9. Adjunct college faculty
[ ] 10. Retired
[ ] 11. Other (please specify)_____

8. What subjects and levels are you certified to teach in this state?

9. Which of the following best describes the type of school in which you teach during the current school year? (Check ALL that apply.)

[ ] 1. Primary elementary
[ ] 2. Upper elementary
[ ] 3. Comprehensive elementary
[ ] 4. Middle
[ ] 5. Junior high
[ ] 6. Senior high
[ ] 7. Comprehensive secondary
[ ] 8. College/university
[ ] 9. Do not currently teach -- administrator/supervisor
[ ] 10. Do not currently teach -- special assignment
[ ] 11. Do not currently teach -- retired
[ ] 12. Other (please specify)

_____

10. Which of the following best describes your current primary teaching assignment? (Check only ONE answer.)

[ ] 1. All or most elementary school subjects
[ ] 2. All or most middle school subjects
[ ] 3. Special education for disabled or other exceptional students, including the gifted and talented
[ ] 4. Arts (e.g., visual arts, music, theater)
[ ] 5. Language arts/communication (e.g., English, foreign language, speech, literature)
[ ] 6. Mathematics (e.g., arithmetic, logic, statistics)
[ ] 7. Computer science
[ ] 8. Physical/biological sciences (e.g., general science, biology, physics, chemistry, geology)
[ ] 9. Social sciences (e.g., geography, psychology, sociology, economics, history, government)
[ ] 10. Home economics
[ ] 11. Business/vocational education (e.g., accounting, typing, shop, craft skills, agriculture)
[ ] 12. Health and physical education
[ ] 13. Curriculum and instruction
[ ] 14. Counseling/educational psychology
[ ] 15. Educational foundations
[ ] 16. Do not currently teach -- administrator/supervisor
[ ] 17. Do not currently teach -- retired
[ ] 18. Do not currently teach -- special assignment
[ ] 19. Other (please specify)_____

11. What grades do you teach during the current school year? (Check ALL that apply.)

[ ] 1. Preschool/Nursery
[ ] 2. Kindergarten
[ ] 3. First
[ ] 4. Second
[ ] 5. Third
[ ] 6. Fourth
[ ] 7. Fifth
[ ] 8. Sixth
[ ] 9. Seventh
[ ] 10. Eighth
[ ] 11. Ninth
[ ] 12. Tenth
[ ] 13. Eleventh
[ ] 14. Twelfth
[ ] 15. Undergraduate
[ ] 16. Graduate
[ ] 17. Do not currently teach -- administrator/supervisor
[ ] 18. Do not currently teach -- retired
[ ] 19. Do not currently teach -- special assignment
[ ] 20. Other (please specify)_____

12. Which of the following subjects have you taught in your teaching career? (Check ALL that apply.)

[ ] 1. All or most elementary school subjects
[ ] 2. All or most middle school subjects
[ ] 3. Special education for disabled or other exceptional students, including the gifted and talented
[ ] 4. Arts (e.g., visual arts, music, theater)
[ ] 5. Language arts/communication (e.g., English, foreign language, speech, literature)
[ ] 6. Mathematics (e.g., arithmetic, logic, statistics)
[ ] 7. Computer science
[ ] 8. Physical/biological sciences (e.g., general science, biology, physics, chemistry, geology)
[ ] 9. Social sciences (e.g., geography, psychology, sociology, economics, history, government)
[ ] 10. Home economics
[ ] 11. Business/vocational education (e.g., accounting, typing, shop, craft skills, agriculture)
[ ] 12. Health and physical education
[ ] 13. Curriculum and instruction
[ ] 14. Counseling/educational psychology
[ ] 15. Educational foundations
[ ] 16. Other (please specify) _____

13. How long, including the current school year, have you taught?

[ ] 1. 1 - 2 years
[ ] 2. 3 - 5 years
[ ] 3. 6 - 10 years
[ ] 4. 11 - 15 years
[ ] 5. 16 - 20 years
[ ] 6. 21 or more years

14. Which of the following best describes your experience in evaluating teachers' performance? (Check ALL that apply and indicate the approximate number of years of experience.)

[ ] 1. Supervisor of classroom teachers _____
[ ] 2. Supervisor of student teachers _____
[ ] 3. Cooperating teacher _____
[ ] 4. Mentor _____
[ ] 5. School administrator _____
[ ] 6. Other (Please specify type of experience and number of years) _____

Date of Revision: September 24, 1991

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™

Document #_____

# CANDIDATE PROFILE

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____ Candidate's ID #_____

The information that you provide is completely confidential and will be used for research purposes only. Please answer the questions by putting a check (✓) next to the choice that most closely describes you or your professional activities based on your typical school-year schedule. Unless otherwise indicated, please check only one response for each question.

1. Which of the following best describes the area in which you work?

[ ] 1. Low income, urban
[ ] 2. Middle or upper income, urban
[ ] 3. Suburban
[ ] 4. Small town (not suburban)
[ ] 5. Rural
[ ] 6. Other (Please specify)_____

2. What is your age?

[ ] 1. Under 25
[ ] 2. 25 - 34
[ ] 3. 35 - 44
[ ] 4. 45 - 54
[ ] 5. 55 - 64
[ ] 6. 65 and over

3. What is your gender?

[ ] 1. Female [ ] 2. Male

4. How would you describe yourself?

[ ] 1. African-American or Black
[ ] 2. Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander
[ ] 3. Mexican American or Chicano
[ ] 4. Native American, Inuit, or Aleut
[ ] 5. Puerto Rican
[ ] 6. Other Hispanic
[ ] 7. White
[ ] 8. Other (please specify)_____

©1991 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

5. What is the highest degree you hold?

[ ] 1. Less than a Bachelor's
[ ] 2. Bachelor's
[ ] 3. Master's or equivalent
[ ] 4. Master's and additional coursework
[ ] 5. Doctorate

6. Please provide the following information regarding your academic background. (Check ALL that apply.)

1. Did you go through an alternate route teacher training program?
[ ] 1. Yes [ ] 2. No

2. Bachelor's degree
[ ] 1. In progress [ ] 2. Completed [ ] 3. Not applicable

Major (please specify)_____

Minor (please specify)_____

3. Master's degree or equivalent
[ ] 1. In progress [ ] 2. Completed [ ] 3. Not applicable

Major field (please specify)_____

4. Doctorate or equivalent
[ ] 1. In progress [ ] 2. Completed [ ] 3. Not applicable

Major field (please specify)_____

7. Which of the following best describes your current status?

[ ] 1. Temporary substitute (assigned on a daily basis)
[ ] 2. Permanent substitute (assigned on a longer term basis)
[ ] 3. Emergency/temporary license
[ ] 4. Student teacher
[ ] 5. First year teacher
[ ] 6. Teacher with one or more years of experience
[ ] 7. Other (please specify)_____

8. Which of the following best describes the type of school in which you teach during the current school year? (Check ALL that apply.)

[ ] 1. Primary elementary
[ ] 2. Upper elementary
[ ] 3. Comprehensive elementary
[ ] 4. Middle
[ ] 5. Junior high
[ ] 6. Senior high
[ ] 7. Comprehensive secondary
[ ] 8. Other (please specify)_____

9. Which of the following best describes your primary teaching assignment? (Check only ONE answer.)

[ ] 1. All or most elementary school subjects
[ ] 2. All or most middle school subjects
[ ] 3. Special education for handicapped or other exceptional students, including the gifted and talented
[ ] 4. Arts (e.g., visual arts, music, theater)
[ ] 5. Language arts/communication (e.g., English, foreign language, speech, literature)
[ ] 6. Mathematics and computer science (e.g., arithmetic, logic, statistics)
[ ] 7. Physical/biological sciences (e.g., general science, biology, physics, chemistry, geology)
[ ] 8. Social sciences (e.g., psychology, sociology, economics, history, geography, government)
[ ] 9. Home economics
[ ] 10. Business and vocational education (e.g., accounting, shop, craft skills, agriculture)
[ ] 11. Health/physical education
[ ] 12. Curriculum and instruction
[ ] 13. Other (please specify)_____

10. What grades do you teach during the school year? (Check ALL that apply.)

[ ] 1. Preschool
[ ] 2. Kindergarten
[ ] 3. First
[ ] 4. Second
[ ] 5. Third
[ ] 6. Fourth
[ ] 7. Fifth
[ ] 8. Sixth
[ ] 9. Seventh
[ ] 10. Eighth
[ ] 11. Ninth
[ ] 12. Tenth
[ ] 13. Eleventh
[ ] 14. Twelfth
[ ] 15. Other (please specify)_____

11. How many years have you taught, including the current year?

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| [ ] | 1. Less than 1 year | [ ] | 5. 7 - 8 years |
| [ ] | 2. 1 - 2 years | [ ] | 6. 9 - 10 years |
| [ ] | 3. 3 - 4 years | [ ] | 7. 10 or more years |
| [ ] | 4. 5 - 6 years | | |

12. Which of the following best describes the school in which you did your practice or student teaching?

[ ] 1. Low income, urban
[ ] 2. Middle or upper income, urban
[ ] 3. Suburban
[ ] 4. Small town (not suburban)
[ ] 5. Rural
[ ] 6. Other (Please specify)_____

13. The paragraphs below describe five possible views of how content is taught. Teachers may teach content in one or more of these ways. Please rank these views in order of the extent to which you agree with each. (5 = strongest agreement; 1 = least agreement)

[ ] The teacher covers as much content as possible. Content is defined as facts, concepts, principles, or laws that have been gathered over time through inquiry into a subject. The teacher reduces the gap between subject and learner by adding content to the learner.

[ ] The teacher assists students in developing skills in the process and method of inquiry that enable people to function within a given academic subject. Process is defined as "methods of operating, strategies, rules of evidence, and forms of arguments that are or can be employed to contribute to the development of the academic subject." The teacher reduces the gap between subject and learners by helping learners add new processes and methods of inquiry to their repertoire.

[ ] The teacher helps students form concepts that are like the concepts formed by experts in the field. Concepts are defined as the models, hypotheses, impressions, and other mental images of phenomena, all of which constitute an important part of the academic subject in question. The teacher reduces the gap between subject and learner by provoking learners to revise their models, hypotheses, or images of fundamental ideas in a subject.

[ ] The teacher socializes students to the values/norms of a field (e.g., competitive, pluralistic, cooperative, reflective decision-makers, civic actors). Students should not only learn the subject matter,but become members of a community of individuals who draw on that subject matter. The teacher reduces the gap between subject and learner by creating a learning community in the classroom, one that draws on the norms of scholarship from the academic subject and on the norms of collegiality and participation that learners tend to prefer.

[ ] The teacher renders academic content relevant and meaningful to diverse learners. Students perceive particular content, processes, or concepts to be relevant or meaningful to their own lives. The teacher chooses analogies or metaphors that are understandable to the student and enable the student to better grasp these ideas. The teacher reduces the gap between subject and learner by rendering subject matter more relevant and meaningful to students, and by transforming students so that they hold cognitive, personal, and social relationships with academic content.

Adapted from: Mary Kennedy. Merging Subjects and Students into Teaching Knowledge. Teachers College Press, 1991.

Date of Revision: September 24, 1991

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™

Document #_____

# CLASS PROFILE

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____ Candidate's ID #_____

School_____ District_____

Grades_____ Subjects or Content Areas_____

Date of Obs._____/_____/_____ Time of Obs._____/_____/_____/_____ Assessment Cycle 1 2 3 4 5 6
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE AM PM

Assessor's SS# (optional)_____ Assessor's ID #_____

Please answer each question. **PLEASE CHECK** (✓) or **PRINT** your responses in the space provided.

1. **TOTAL NUMBER** of students enrolled in the class to be observed [ ]

2. No. of **MALE** students: [ ] | 3. No. of **FEMALE** students: [ ] | 4. **AGE** range: [ ]

5. No. of students identified in each **ETHNIC GROUP**:

[ ] 1. Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander
[ ] 2. Black or African American
[ ] 3. Mexican American, Chicano, Puerto Rican, or other Hispanic
[ ] 4. Native American
[ ] 5. White
[ ] 6. Other (please specify)_____

6. No. of students in each of the following **LANGUAGE** categories:

[ ] 1. English is the student's first language
[ ] 2. English is **NOT** the student's first language

7. No. of students from each type of residential area:

[ ] 1. Urban
[ ] 2. Suburban
[ ] 3. Rural
[ ] 4. Other (please specify)_____

8. Please describe the **SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND** of the students in this class:

9. Are students assigned to this class on the basis of **SKILL LEVEL?** Yes [ ] No [ ]

©1991 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are regi tered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
he Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning achers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational esting Service.

10. Which of these categories best describes the **SKILL LEVEL** of the students in this class:

[ ] 1. All, or nearly all, are **ABOVE AVERAGE/ADVANCED**.
[ ] 2. All, or nearly all, are **AVERAGE/INTERMEDIATE**.
[ ] 3. All, or nearly all, are **BELOW AVERAGE/BEGINNING.**
[ ] 4. Some are **ABOVE AVERAGE** and some are **AVERAGE STUDENTS.**
[ ] 5. Some are **AVERAGE** and some are **BELOW AVERAGE**.
[ ] 6. The class is a mixture of **ABOVE AVERAGE, AVERAGE, BELOW AVERAGE.**

11. If you will be grouping students for this class period, please explain briefly how that will be done.

12. Number of students in this class who have been identified as having **EXCEPTIONALITIES**:

[ ] 1. Gifted
[ ] 2. Learning disabled
[ ] 3. Physically disabled
[ ] 4. Other (please specify)_____

[ ] Please indicate (✓) if district/school policy prohibits giving out this information

13. If you filled in any of the categories listed in 12 above, please explain how these categories are defined in your school.

14. Are there any **BEHAVIOR PATTERNS, STUDENT INTERACTIONS** or anticipated **INTERRUPTIONS** that you think the assessor should be aware of in order to understand what will occur during the scheduled observation? If so, please explain.

15. Is there anything about the **LEARNING ENVIRONMENT** that you think might affect your students and/or the scheduled observation? If so, please explain.

16. What **CLASSROOM ROUTINES, PROCEDURES, RULES,** and **EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT BEHAVIOR** will be in operation during this class (e.g., taking attendance, collecting papers, reviewing work, ways of interacting with one another, safety precautions)?

17. What **SCHOOLWIDE ROUTINES, PROCEDURES,** or **POLICIES,** if any, should the assessor be aware of when observing this class?

18. Do you expect to have any students **ENTER** and/or **LEAVE** the **CLASSROOM** during the scheduled observation? If so, please explain why they will do so.

19. How will you **ACCOMMODATE STUDENTS** who miss all or part of this lesson?

20. What is the **LOCATION** of the scheduled observation?

[ ] a. Your own room/instructional area
[ ] b. Not your own room/instructional area, but one you regularly use
[ ] c. A room/instructional area that you occasionally use
[ ] d. Other (please explain)_____

21. In the space below, please provide a simple **SKETCH** of the arrangement/layout of the instructional space for this lesson (e.g., student desks, teacher desk, student work space, arrangement of playing field or laboratory.) Please attach a **SEATING CHART**, if available, or a **LIST** of students for the class to be observed.

Date of Revision: September 24, 1991

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers®

Document #_____

# INSTRUCTION PROFILE

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____Candidate's ID #_____

Date of Obs._____/_____/_____Time of Obs._____/_____/_____/_____Assessment Cycle 1 2 3 4 5 6
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE AM PM

Assessor's SS# (optional)_____Assessor's ID #_____

Please respond to all questions. Use a pen and **PRINT** your responses in the space provided.

1. What do you want your students to learn during this class period? If appropriate, include social, affective, aesthetic and/or psychomotor goals.

©Educational Testing Service, 1991. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. What instructional **MATERIALS** will you use to reach your goals during the class period to be observed? If appropriate, please staple to this form a copy of any **STUDENT MATERIALS** you plan to use with this class (e.g., map, vocabulary list, questions to be answered, printed instructions, homework).

3. What learning **ACTIVITY** or **ACTIVITIES** do you have planned for the students in this class? Briefly outline the sequence of activities for this class period. (e.g., What will happen first? Next? How do you plan to end the class?)

4. How will you know that the students have learned what you intended them to learn? If appropriate, please staple to this form a copy of your **EVALUATION PLAN/INSTRUMENT** (e.g., a list of oral questions, written quiz, student demonstration of a skill).

Date of Revision: September 24, 1991

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™

Document #_____

# REOBSERVATION CONFERENCE INTERVIEW

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____Candidate's ID #_____

Date of Obs._____/_____/_____Time of Obs._____/_____/____/_____Assessment Cycle 1 2 3 4 5 6
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE AM PM

Assessor's SS# (optional)_____Assessor's ID #_____

1. Will there be any changes today to your **CLASS** and **INSTRUCTION PROFILES**? If so, what will they be?

(Review the candidate's **GOALS** and/or **OBJECTIVES** from the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** with the candidate and then ask the candidate the following question)

2. Tell me why have you chosen these **GOALS** and/or **OBJECTIVES**?

©1991 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
Educational Testing Service, ETS, and the ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

(Review **MATERIALS** the candidate has identified in the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** and then ask the candidate the following question)

3. Tell me why have you chosen these instructional **MATERIALS**?

(Review the learning **ACTIVITIES** from the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** with the candidate and then ask the candidate the following question)

4. Tell me why have you chosen these learning **ACTIVITIES**?

(Review the candidate's **EVALUATION PLAN** from the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** and then ask the candidate the following question)

5. Why have you chosen to evaluate student learning using the methods you have described?

6. How is today's lesson related to what you have planned for students to learn tomorrow, next week or in the weeks ahead?

7. How does what you have planned build on **INDIVIDUAL** and **GROUP DIFFERENCES?**

8. How do you learn about your **STUDENTS' BACKGROUNDS** (e.g., students' prior knowledge, family, culture, experiences outside of school)?

Date of Revision: September 25, 1991 Document #_____

DRAFT

# CLASS OBSERVATION RECORD

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____ Candidate's ID#_____

Date of Obs.____/____/____ Time of Obs.____/____/____/____ Assessment Cycle
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE AM PM No. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Assessor's SS#_____ Assessor's ID#_____

| Time | Teacher-Student Interaction | Code |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

©1991 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. Educational Testing Service, ETS, and the ETS Logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Date of Revision: September 25, 1991 Document #_____

DRAFT

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____ Candidate's ID#_____

te of Obs.___/___/___ Time of Obs.___/___/___/___ Assessment Cycle 1 2 3 4 5 6
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE AM PM

Assessor's SS#_____ Assessor's ID#_____

| Time | Teacher-Student Interaction | Code |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

©1991 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. Educational Testing Service, ETS, and the ETS Logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Date of Revision: September 25, 1991

Document #_____

DRAFT

# CLASS OBSERVATION RECORD

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____ Candidate's ID#_____

Date of Obs. ____/____/____ Time of Obs. ____/____/____/____ Assessment Cycle 1 2 3 4 5 6
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE AM PM

Assessor's SS# (optional)_____ Assessor's ID#_____

| Time | Teacher-Student Interaction | Code |
|---|---|---|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| 202 | | |
| | | |

203

©1991 Educati Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE TS, and the ETS Logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
The Praxis S : Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design l e trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

Date of Revision: September 24, 1991

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers™

Document #_____

# _OSTOBSERVATION CONFERENCE INTERVIEW

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____Candidate's ID #_____

Date of Obs._____/_____/_____Time of Obs._____/_____/_____/_____Assessment Cycle 1 2 3 4 5 6
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE AM PM

Assessor's SS# (optional)_____Assessor's ID #_____

1. To what extent do you feel you accomplished your **GOALS/OBJECTIVES**?

2. To what extent did the instructional **MATERIALS** you used help you achieve your purposes?

3. To what extent did the **ACTIVITIES** you used help you achieve your purposes?

©1991 Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and the ETS Logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
The Praxis Series: Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

4. Did you **DEPART** from what you intended to do during this class period? If so, why?

5. If you could do this class period over again with this particular class, would you do anything **DIFFERENTLY**? If so, what would that be?

6. Based on today's results, what will you **PLAN NEXT** for this class?

(Note an individual or group of students who appeared to be **DOING WELL** with the instructional tasks, then ask the candidate the following question.)

7. Would you please comment on how _____ did today?

(Note an individual or group of students who appeared to have a **PROBLEM** with the instructional tasks, then ask the candidate the following question.)

8. Would you please comment on how _____ did today?

9. In what ways do you work with teachers and other professional staff in the school to solve student or classroom issues and problems, coordinate learning activities or obtain suggestions for improving your teaching skills, especially as these activities relate to the students in this class period?

10. Please describe what **INTERACTIONS** or **COMMUNICATIONS** you have had **WITH THE FAMILIES** of the students in this class period.

11. What involvement do you have with the **COMMUNITIES** of the students in this class period?

Date of Revision: September 25, 1991

Document # _____

THE PRAXIS SERIES
Professional Assessments for Beginning Teachers®

# RECORD OF EVIDENCE

Candidate's SS# (optional)_____ Candidate's ID #_____

Date of Obs._____/_____/_____ Time of Obs._____/_____/_____/_____ Assessment Cycle 1 2 3 4 5 6
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE AM PM

Assessor's SS# (optional)_____ Assessor's ID #_____

## A. ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHING

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | A1. Demonstrating application of content knowledge through accurate instruction | | | | | | |
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | A2. Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was studied previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be studied in the future | | | | | | |

Copyright 1991. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service.
THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## A. ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHING (cont'd)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | A3. Creating or selecting appropriate curricular materials/resources and learning activities that are clearly linked to the goals or intents of the lesson | | | | | | |

Materials and resources

Learning activities

| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | A4. Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are clearly linked to the goals or intents of the lesson | | | | | | |

## A. ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHING (cont'd)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | A5. ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR TEACHING<br>Additional Comments: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

## B. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING

| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | B1. Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' prior knowledge, skills, experience, and cultures | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | B2. Helping students activate relevant aspects of their prior knowledge, skills, experiences, and cultural resources in order to promote learning | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## B. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | B3. Making content comprehensible to students | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | B4. Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

## B. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | B5. Setting high expectations for each student, making learning expectations clear to students, and helping students accept responsibility for their own learning | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | B6. Encouraging students to extend their own thinking | | | | | | |

## B. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | B7. Using instructional time effectively | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | Domain B. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING<br><br>Additional comments: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## C. CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | C1. Creating a purposeful and well-functioning learning community with convenient and well-understood classroom routines | | | | | | |
| | | | | | C2. Making the physical environment as conducive to learning as possible | | | | | | |

## C. CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING (con't)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | C3. Establishing and consistently maintaining clear standards of behavior | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | C4. Creating a climate that ensures equity and respect for and among students, and between students and their teacher | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

## C. CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING (con't)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | C5. Establishing and maintaining rapport with students in ways that are appropriate to the students' developmental levels | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | Domain C. CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING<br><br>Additional comments: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## D. TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | D1. Reflecting on the extent to which the instructional goals were met | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | D2. Explaining how insights gained from instructional experiences can be used subsequently | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

## D. TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM (cont'd)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | D3. Demonstrating acceptance of responsiblity for student learning | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | D4. Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and coordinate learning activities for students | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

## D. TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM (cont'd)

| Source of Evidence | | | | | | Evaluation | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | D5. Communicating with families regarding student learning, and, where appropriate, interacting effectively with the community | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | Domain D. TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM<br>Additional comments: | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cls | Instr | Pre | Obs | Pos | OVERALL PERFORMANCE | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

# Appendix H: Instruments/Forms Used in Praxis III
(Fall 1992 Version)

# CANDIDATE PROFILE

Candidate ID #: _____ Social Security # ___-___-____
Last Name: _____ First Name: _____ MI: ____
School/Organization: _____ District: _____
Work Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____ Telephone #: ( ) ___-____
Home Address: _____
City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____ Telephone #: ( ) ___-____

Please answer the questions by putting a check (✓) next to the choice that most closely describes you or your professional activities. Unless otherwise indicated, please check only one response for each question. Please respond to all questions.

1. What is your age?

   ○ a. Under 25
   ○ b. 25 - 34
   ○ c. 35 - 44
   ○ d. 45 - 54
   ○ e. 55 - 64
   ○ f. 65 or over

2. What is your gender?

   ○ a. Female
   ○ b. Male

3. With respect to the following categories, how would you describe yourself?

   ○ a. African American or Black, non-Hispanic
   ○ b. Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander
   ○ c. Mexican American or Chicano
   ○ d. Native American, Inuit, or Aleut
   ○ e. Puerto Rican
   ○ f. Other Hispanic
   ○ g. White, non-Hispanic
   ○ h. Other (please specify) _____

Question 4 -7
Please provide the following information regarding your **ACADEMIC BACKGROUND**. (Check and complete **ALL** that apply.)

4. Bachelor's degree

   ○ a. Not begun
   ○ b. In progress
   ○ c. Completed

   Major (please specify) _____
   Minor (please specify) _____

5. Master's degree or equivalent

   ○ a. Not begun
   ○ b. In progress
   ○ c. Completed

   Major (please specify) _____

6. Doctorate or equivalent

   ○ a. Not begun
   ○ b. In progress
   ○ c. Completed

   Major (please specify) _____

7. Are you going through an alternate-route teacher training program?

   ○ a. Yes
   ○ b. No

Copyright 1992. Educational Testing Service. All rights Reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

. Which of the following best describes the type of SCHOOL in which you are CURRENTLY teaching?

- ○ a. Primary elementary
- ○ b. Upper elementary
- ○ c. Comprehensive elementary
- ○ d. Middle
- ○ e. Junior high
- ○ f. Senior high
- ○ g. Comprehensive secondary
- ○ h. Other (please specify) _____

9. Which of the following best describes your current status?

- ○ a. Temporary substitute teacher (assigned on a daily basis)
- ○ b. Permanent substitute teacher (assigned on a long-term basis)
- ○ c. Teacher with emergency/temporary license
- ○ d. Student teacher
- ○ e. First-year teacher
- ○ f. Teacher with one or more years of experience
- ○ g. Other (please specify) _____

Copyright 1992. Educational Testing Service. All rights Reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of ducational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of ducational Testing Service.

# SSESSOR PROFILE

sessor ID #: _____ Social Security # ___-___-___
st Name: _____ First Name: _____ MI: ____
hool/Organization: _____ District: _____
ork Address: _____
ty: _____ State: ____ Zip: _____ Telephone #: ( ) ___-____
me Address: _____
ty: _____ State: ____ Zip: _____ Telephone #: ( ) ___-____

Please answer the questions by putting a check (✓) next to the choice that most closely describes you or your professional activities. Unless otherwise indicated, please check only one response for each question. Please respond to all questions.

1. What is your age?

   ○ a. Under 25
   ○ b. 25 - 34
   ○ c. 35 - 44
   ○ d. 45 - 54
   ○ e. 55 - 64
   ○ f. 64 or over

2. What is your gender?

   ○ a. Female
   ○ b. Male

3. With respect to the following categories, how would you describe yourself?

   ○ a. African American or Black, non-Hispanic
   ○ b. Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander
   ○ c. Mexican American or Chicano
   ○ d. Native American, Inuit, or Aleut
   ○ e. Puerto Rican
   ○ f. Other Hispanic
   ○ g. White, non-Hispanic
   ○ h. Other (please specify) _____

Question 4 - 7
Please provide the following information regarding your **ACADEMIC BACKGROUND**. (Check and complete **ALL** that apply.)

4. Bachelor's degree

   ○ a. Not begun
   ○ b. In progress
   ○ c. Completed

   Major (please specify) _____
   Minor (please specify) _____

5. Master's degree or equivalent

   ○ a. Not begun
   ○ b. In progress
   ○ c. Completed

   Major (please specify) _____

6. Doctorate or equivalent

   ○ a. Not begun
   ○ b. In progress
   ○ c. Completed

   Major (please specify) _____

7. Did you go through an alternate-route teacher training program?

   ○ a. Yes
   ○ b. No

© Copyright 1992. Educational Testing Service. All rights Reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

8. Which of the following best describes the type of **SCHOOL** in which you are teaching?

- ○ a. Not currently teaching
- ○ b. Primary elementary
- ○ c. Upper elementary
- ○ d. Comprehensive elementary
- ○ e. Middle
- ○ f. Junior high
- ○ g. Senior high
- ○ h. Comprehensive secondary
- ○ i. Post-secondary
- ○ j. Other (please specify) _____

9. Which of the following best describes the level of your primary teaching assignment?

- ○ a. Not currently teaching
- ○ b. Pre-Kindergarten - Grade 2
- ○ c. Grades 3 - 5
- ○ d. Grades 6 - 8
- ○ e. Grades 9 - 12
- ○ f. More than one of the levels above

10. Which of the following best describes the content of your primary teaching assignment?

- ○ a. Not currently teaching
- ○ b. All or most elementary school subjects
- ○ c. All or most middle school subjects
- ○ d. Visual arts/music/theatre/dance
- ○ e. Language arts/communications
- ○ f. Mathematics
- ○ g. Computer science
- ○ h. Physical/biological/chemical sciences
- ○ i. Social sciences
- ○ j. Home economics
- ○ k. Business
- ○ l. Vocational education
- ○ m. Health/physical education
- ○ n. Foreign language
- ○ o. English as a second language
- ○ p. Special education
- ○ q. Other (specify subject) _____

11. How many years have you taught, including the current year?

- ○ a. Less than 1 year
- ○ b. 1 - 2 years
- ○ c. 3 - 4 years
- ○ d. 5 - 6 years
- ○ e. 7 - 8 years
- ○ f. 9 - 10 years
- ○ g. 10 or more years

12. Which of the following best describes your current status?

- ○ a. Emergency/temporary teacher license
- ○ b. Regular teacher, classroom (licensed, not a substitute)
- ○ c. Regular teacher, special assignment
- ○ d. Substitute teacher
- ○ e. Principal or assistant principal
- ○ f. School administrator, other than principal or assistant
- ○ g. Supervisor
- ○ h. State administrator
- ○ i. College faculty
- ○ j. Retired
- ○ k. Other (please specify) _____

13. Which of the following describes your experience in evaluating teachers' performance? (Indicate the number of years of experience for each situation that applies.)

- ___ a. Supervisor of classroom teachers
- ___ b. Supervisor of student teachers
- ___ c. Cooperating teacher
- ___ d. Mentor
- ___ e. School administrator
- ___ f. Other (please specify) _____

14. What subjects are you licensed to teach in this state? (Check **ALL** categories on the next page that apply.)

Copyright 1992. Educational Testing Service. All rights Reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of ducational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of ducational Testing Service.

## LICENSING FIELDS

### Education Subject Areas

- ○ 101 Agricultural Education
- ○ 102 Art Education
- ○ 103 Bilingual and Bicultural Education
- ○ 104 Business Education
- ○ 105 Cooperative Education
- ○ 106 English Education
- ○ 107 Environmental Education
- ○ 108 Health Education
- ○ 109 Home Economics Education
- ○ 110 Industrial Arts
- ○ 111 Life Science Education
- ○ 112 Marketing and Distributive Education
- ○ 113 Mathematics Education
- ○ 114 Music Education
- ○ 115 Office Technology Education
- ○ 116 Physical Education
- ○ 117 Physical Science Education
- ○ 118 Reading Education
- ○ 119 Reading Specialist
- ○ 120 Secretarial Education
- ○ 121 Social Studies Education
- ○ 122 Teaching English as a Foreign Language
- ○ 199 Other (please specify) _____

### Elementary and Pre-Elementary Education

- ○ 201 Early Childhood Education
- ○ 202 Elementary Education
- ○ 203 Pre-Elementary Education
- ○ 299 Other (please specify) _____

### Humanities

- ○ 301 Art
- ○ 302 Drama
- ○ 303 English
- ○ 304 Fine Arts
- ○ 305 French
- ○ 306 German
- ○ 307 Italian
- ○ 308 Japanese
- ○ 309 Latin
- ○ 310 Literature
- ○ 311 Music
- ○ 312 Philosophy, Religion, or Theology
- ○ 313 Russian
- ○ 314 Spanish
- ○ 315 Speech Communication
- ○ 316 Writing
- ○ 399 Other (please specify) _____



### Mathematics and Natural Sciences

- ○ 401 Biology
- ○ 402 Botany
- ○ 403 Chemistry
- ○ 404 Computer and Information Sciences
- ○ 405 Earth/Space Science
- ○ 406 Engineering
- ○ 407 Engineering Technologies
- ○ 408 General Science
- ○ 409 Geology
- ○ 410 Mathematics
- ○ 411 Physics
- ○ 499 Other (please specify) _____

### Non-Teaching Education

- ○ 501 Educational Administration
- ○ 502 Educational Psychology
- ○ 503 Library and Archival Sciences
- ○ 504 School Guidance/Counseling
- ○ 505 School Psychology
- ○ 506 School Social Work
- ○ 507 Supervision
- ○ 599 Other (please specify) _____

### Social Sciences

- ○ 601 Anthropology
- ○ 602 Business
- ○ 603 Communications
- ○ 604 Economics
- ○ 605 Geography
- ○ 606 Government
- ○ 607 History
- ○ 608 Political Science
- ○ 609 Psychology
- ○ 610 Public Affairs and Services
- ○ 611 Social Studies
- ○ 612 Sociology
- ○ 699 Other (please specify) _____

### Special Education

- ○ 701 Audiology
- ○ 702 Education of Students with Mental Retardation
- ○ 703 Reading Education
- ○ 704 Special Education
- ○ 705 Speech Language Pathology
- ○ 706 Teaching Speech to Students with Language Disabilities
- ○ 707 Teaching Students with Emotional Disabilities
- ○ 708 Teaching Students with Hearing Disabilities
- ○ 709 Teaching Students with Learning Disabilities
- ○ 710 Teaching Students with Minimal Mental Disabilities
- ○ 711 Teaching Students with Orthopedic Disabilities
- ○ 712 Teaching Students with Physical and Mental Disabilities
- ○ 713 Teaching Students with Visual Disabilities
- ○ 799 Other (please specify) _____

### Vocational/Technical Majors

- ○ 801 Accounting
- ○ 802 Agriculture
- ○ 803 Architecture and Environmental Design
- ○ 804 Home Economics
- ○ 805 Military Sciences
- ○ 806 Office Technology
- ○ 899 Other (please specify) _____

### Levels

- ○ K - 6
- ○ K - 8
- ○ 7 - 12
- ○ 9 - 12
- ○ K - 12

# CLASS PROFILE

Candidate Name: _____ Candidate ID # _____ Social Security # ___-___-_____
School _____ District: _____
Grade(s) ___ Subject(s) _____ Room #/Location ____ Date of Observation ____/____/____
Month Day Year

Number of Assessors Present for Observation _____

Please use a **PEN** and **CHECK** (✓) or **PRINT** your responses in the space provided. Unless otherwise indicated, check only one response for each question. Please respond to all questions.

1. Which of the following best describes the **LEVEL** of the class being observed?

   ○ a. Pre-Kindergarten - Grade 2
   ○ b. Grades 3-5
   ○ c. Grades 6-8
   ○ d. Grades 9-12
   ○ e. More than one of the levels above
   (please specify) _____

2. Which of the following best describes the **CONTENT** of the class being observed?

   ○ a. Business
   ○ b. Computer science
   ○ c. English as a second language
   ○ d. Foreign language
   ○ e. Health/physical education
   ○ f. Home economics
   ○ g. Language arts/communications
   ○ h. Mathematics
   ○ j. Physical/biological/chemical sciences
   ○ k. Social sciences
   ○ l. Special education
   ○ m. Visual arts/music/theater/dance
   ○ n. Vocational education
   ○ o. Other (please specify) _____

3. Which of the following best describes the areas from which your students come? (Check **ALL** that apply.)

   ○ a. Low income, urban
   ○ b. Middle or upper income, urban
   ○ c. Low income, suburban
   ○ d. Middle or upper income, suburban
   ○ e. Low income, small town (not suburban)
   ○ f. Middle or upper income, small town (not suburban)
   ○ g. Low income, rural
   ○ h. Middle or upper income, rural

4. [ ] What is the **TOTAL NUMBER** of students enrolled in the class to be observed?

5. [ ] a. What is the number of **MALE** students?

   [ ] b. What is the number of **FEMALE** students?

6. [ ] What is the **AGE** range for all of the students in the class?

7. What is the estimated number of students identified in each **RACIAL/ETHNIC GROUP?**

   [ ] a. African American or Black

   [ ] b. Asian American/Asian [Ex.: Japanese, Chinese, Korean)

   [ ] c. Southeast Asian American/Southeast Asian (Ex.: Cambodian, Hmong, Khmer, laotian, Vietnamese)

   [ ] d. Pacific Island American/Pacific Islander

   [ ] e. Mexican, Mexican American, or Chicano

   [ ] f. Puerto Rican

   [ ] g. Other Hispanic, Latino, or Latin American

   [ ] h. Native American, American Indian, or Alaskan Native

   [ ] i. White

   [ ] j. Other (please specify)

8. What is the estimated number of students in each of the following **LANGUAGE** categories?

   [ ] a. English language proficient

   [ ] b. Limited English language proficient

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

9. Approximately what **PERCENTAGE** of your class can be categorized as the following?

(Percentage)

[ ] a. Above-average or advanced skill level
[ ] b. Average or intermediate skill level
[ ] c. Below-average skill level
100% Total

10. Approximately how many students in this class have been identified as having **EXCEPTIONALITIES**?

[ ] a. Blind or visually impaired
[ ] b. Deaf or hearing impaired
[ ] c. Developmentally disabled
[ ] d. Emotionally or behaviorally disabled
[ ] e. Gifted
[ ] f. Learning disabled
[ ] g. Physically disabled
[ ] h. Other (please specify) _____

11. Is there anything about the **LEARNING ENVIRONMENT** that you think might affect your students or the scheduled observation (e.g., this is not your own classroom; there is a new display, pet, or equipment in the room; there is construction going on in the building)? If so, please note.

12. What are the most important **CLASSROOM ROUTINES, PROCEDURES, RULES** and **EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT BEHAVIOR** that will be in operation during the observed lesson (e.g., collecting papers, reviewing homework, safety precautions)?

13. Are there any **CIRCUMSTANCES** that the assessor should be aware of in order to understand what will occur during the scheduled observation (e.g., use of schoolwide discipline, schoolwide policies, interruptions, behavior patterns of certain students)? If so, please explain.

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

14. In the space below, please provide a simple **SKETCH** of the arrangement of the instructional space for this lesson (e.g., student desks, teacher desk, student work space, arrangement of playing field or laboratory). Please attach a **SEATING CHART** with the students' names, if available, or a **LIST** of students for the class to be observed.

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

P 2/9/93

# INSTRUCTION PROFILE

Candidate Name: _____ Candidate ID # _____ Social Security # ___ - ___ - _____
Subject: _____ Grade: _____
Date of Observation ___/___/___
MONTH DAY YEAR

Please use a **PEN** and **PRINT** your responses in the space provided. Respond to all questions.

1. What are your **GOALS** for student learning for this class period? In other words, what changes do you hope will occur in the students as a result of this class period? Include learning goals in any domain that is relevant to the lesson (e.g., academic, social, affective, cognitive, aesthetic, and/or psychomotor goals).

2. Where appropriate in **PLANNING THIS LESSON**, how have you used or accommodated the diverse experiences, related to the categories listed below, that your students bring to class?

   a. Gender

   b. Race/ethnicity

   c. English language proficiency

   d. Economic status

   e. Skill level

   f. Exceptionalities

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

P 2/9/93

3. How does the **CONTENT** of this lesson build on what has been learned **PREVIOUSLY**?

4. How does the **CONTENT** of this lesson relate to what students will be learning in the **FUTURE**?

5. What teaching **METHODS** have you selected to help you achieve your learning goals (e.g., teacher presentation, peer teaching, programmed instruction, etc.)?

6. What learning **ACTIVITIES** have you planned for this class (e.g., game to learn map skills, drawing the action in a story, quiz, etc.)? Briefly outline the sequence of activities and indicate approximately how much time you plan to spend on each.

| Activity | Allocated Time |
|---|---|

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

7. What instructional **MATERIALS**, if any, will you use to help your students reach the specified learning goals? If appropriate, please **STAPLE** to this form a copy of any student **MATERIALS** you plan to use with this class (e.g., map, vocabulary list, questions to be answered, printed instructions, homework).

8. If you will be **GROUPING** students for this class period, please provide the following information.

a. Group Name or Number | Number of Students | Basis for Group Membership

b. Is this a **TYPICAL** grouping pattern for this class? If not, please explain.

9. How will you know that the students have learned what you intended them to learn? If appropriate, please **STAPLE** to this form a copy of your **EVALUATION PLAN** or **INSTRUMENT** (e.g., a list of oral questions, written quiz, student demonstration of a skill, or any other evaluation strategy you plan to use).

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

# PREOBSERVATION INTERVIEW

Candidate Name: _____ Candidate ID # _____ Social Security # ___ - ___ - _____

Assessor Name: _____ Assessor ID # _____ Social Security # ___ - ___ - _____

Date of Observation ___/___/___ (MONTH DAY YEAR) Start Time of Interview ___/___ (HOUR MINUTE) End Time of Interview ___/___ (HOUR MINUTE)

(Introduce yourself and explain the purpose of the interview.)

1. I've reviewed your **CLASS** and **INSTRUCTION** Profiles. Please take a few moments to look them over and tell me if there have been any changes in these since you completed them.

(Review the candidate's **GOALS** from the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** (question 1) with the candidate and probe for clarity, making notations directly on the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** form. Then ask the candidate the following question.)

2. Why have you chosen these **GOALS?**

3. How do the connections between this lesson past learning and future learning reflect the **ORGANIZATION** of the **SUBJECT** or **DISCIPLINE** as a whole?

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

P 2/9/93

4a. What **PRIOR KNOWLEDGE** and **SKILLS** do students need in order to be successful in reaching the goal(s) of the lesson?

b. How do you become **FAMILIAR** with the **PRIOR KNOWLEDGE** and **SKILLS** your students bring to this and other lessons?

(Review Question 2 in the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** with the candidate and ask the following question.)

5a. How do you become **FAMILIAR** with your students' **CULTURAL RESOURCES** (e.g., experiences outside of school, approaches to learning, styles of interacting and relating)?

b. How does this lesson accommodate and use your students' **CULTURAL RESOURCES**?

c. Why are the accommodations you have made **IMPORTANT** to student learning?

(Review the **TEACHING METHODS** from the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** (question 5) with the candidate and probe for clarity, making notations directly on the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** form. Then ask the candidate the following question.)

6. Why have you chosen these **TEACHING METHODS**?
(**EXPLORE** the relationship to the stated **LEARNING GOALS** and to the background and experiences of the **STUDENTS** in the class.)

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

(Review the learning **ACTIVITIES** from the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** (question 6) with the candidate and probe for clarity, making notations directly on the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** form. Then ask the candidate the following question.)

7. Why have you chosen these particular learning **ACTIVITIES**? (**EXPLORE** the relationship to the stated **LEARNING GOALS** and to the background and experiences of the **STUDENTS** in the class.)

(Review **MATERIALS** the candidate has identified in the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** (question 7) and probe for clarity, making notations directly on the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** form. Then ask the candidate the following question.)

8. Why have you chosen these **INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS**? (**EXPLORE** the relationship to the stated **LEARNING GOALS** and to the background and experiences of the **STUDENTS** in the class.)

(Review the **EVALUATION PLAN** from the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** (question 9) and probe for clarity, making notations directly on the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** form. Then ask the candidate the following questions.)

9a. Why have you chosen to **EVALUATE** student learning using the strategies you've described? (**EXPLORE** the relationship to the stated **LEARNING GOALS** and to the **STUDENTS** in the class.)

9b. If student outcomes are not going to be evaluated today, when will this occur? (Ask the candidate to describe **FUTURE** evaluation.)

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

P 2/9/93

# CLASS OBSERVATION RECORD



Candidate Name: _____ Candidate ID # _____ Date of Obs. __/__/__
Assessor Name: _____ Assessor ID # _____ MONTH DAY YEAR

| Time | Comments | | Code |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (1) | |
| | | (2) | |
| | | (3) | |
| | | (4) | |
| | | (5) | |
| | | (6) | |
| | | (7) | |
| | | (8) | |
| | | (9) | |
| | | (10) | |
| | | (11) | |
| | | (12) | |
| | | (13) | |
| | | (14) | |
| | | (15) | |
| | | (16) | |
| | | (17) | |
| | | (18) | |
| | | (19) | |
| | | (20) | |
| | | (21) | |
| | | (22) | |
| | | (23) | |
| | | (24) | |
| | | (25) | |
| | | (26) | |

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

P 2/9/93

# CLASS OBSERVATION RECORD (Cont'd.)

Candidate Name: _____ Candidate ID # _____ Date of Obs. _/__/__
MONTH DAY YEAR

Assessor Name: _____ Assessor ID # _____

| Time | Comments | | Code |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | (1) | |
| | | (2) | |
| | | (3) | |
| | | (4) | |
| | | (5) | |
| | | (6) | |
| | | (7) | |
| | | (8) | |
| | | (9) | |
| | | (10) | |
| | | (11) | |
| | | (12) | |
| | | (13) | |
| | | (14) | |
| | | (15) | |
| | | (16) | |
| | | (17) | |
| | | (18) | |
| | | (19) | |
| | | (20) | |
| | | (21) | |
| | | (22) | |
| | | (23) | |
| | | (24) | |
| | | (25) | |
| | | (26) | |
| | | (27) | |
| | | (28) | |

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

# POSTOBSERVATION INTERVIEW

Candidate Name: _____ Candidate ID # _____ Social Security # ___-___-____
Assessor Name: _____ Assessor ID # _____ Social Security # ___-___-____
Date of Observation ___/___/___ (MONTH DAY YEAR) Start Time of Interview ___/___ (HOUR MINUTE) End Time of Interview ___/___ (HOUR MINUTE)

1a. (Review the information on **INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS** from the **INSTRUCTION PROFILE** and the **PREOBSERVATION INTERVIEW.**)
In light of your **INSTRUCTIONAL GOALS**, how do you think the lesson went?

b. Did the students learn what you wanted them to learn? How do you know that the students learned or did not learn what you wanted them to learn?
(Make certain that the candidate **COMMENTS** on each **LEARNING GOAL** noted in the Instruction Profile.)

c. Were the teaching **METHODS** effective? How do you know they were or were not effective?

d. Were the **ACTIVITIES** you used helpful? How do you know they were or were not helpful?

e. Were the **MATERIALS** you used helpful? How do you know they were or were not helpful?

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

2. Did you **DEPART** from anything you had planned to do during this class period? If so, when and why?

3. If you could teach this class period over again to the same class:

a. What would you do **DIFFERENTLY**? Why?
(Probe for specific evidence.)

b. What would you do the **SAME**? Why?
(Probe for specific evidence.)

4. Based on what happened today, what do you plan to do **NEXT** with this class?
(Probe for specific ideas or plans.)

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

(Note an **INDIVIDUAL** or **GROUP** of students who appeared to be **DOING WELL** with the instructional tasks; then ask the candidate the following questions.)

5a. How do you think _____ performed today?

b. How do you account for this performance?

c. What might you try in the future with _____?

(Note an **INDIVIDUAL** or **GROUP** of students who appeared to be **HAVING PROBLEMS** with the instructional tasks; then ask the candidate the following questions.)

6a. How do you think _____ performed today?

b. How do you account for this performance?

c. What might you try in the future with _____?

7. When you need **ASSISTANCE** with your teaching skills, or when you have **PROBLEMS** with a particular student, whom do you talk with?

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

8. Do you **COORDINATE** learning activities with other teachers? If so, why and how?

9a. What forms of **COMMUNICATION** do you use with the **PARENTS OR GUARDIANS** of the students in this class?

b. How and under what conditions do you use them?

10. Is there **ANYTHING ELSE** you feel I should know about today's lesson?

11. I have several questions about the lesson.
(This is your last opportunity to ask questions about any information collected during the assessment cycle for which you need clarification.)

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

# RECORD OF EVIDENCE

Candidate Name: _____ Candidate ID # _____ Social Security # ___ - ___ - _____
Assessor Name: _____ Assessor ID # _____ District: _____
School: _____ District: _____
Grade(s) _____ Subject(s) _____
Date of Obs. ____/____/____ Start Time of Obs. ____/____ End Time of Obs. ____/____
MONTH DAY YEAR HOUR MINUTE HOUR MINUTE

Number of Assessors Present for Observation _____

## A. ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR STUDENT LEARNING

Evaluation

A1. Becoming familiar with relevant aspects of students' background, knowledge and experiences

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

A2. Articulating clear learning goals for the lesson that are appropriate for the students

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## A. ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

A3. Demonstrating an understanding of the connections between the content that was learned previously, the current content, and the content that remains to be learned in the future

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

A4. Creating or selecting teaching methods, learning activities and instructional materials or other resources that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Teaching methods:

Learning activities:

Instructional materials and resources:

Summary Statement:

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## A. ORGANIZING CONTENT KNOWLEDGE FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

A5. Creating or selecting evaluation strategies that are appropriate for the students and that are aligned with the goals of the lesson

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

Use this space for any additional comments on the criteria in Domain A.

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## B. CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING

B1. Creating a climate that promotes fairness

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

B2. Establishing and maintaining rapport with students

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## B. CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

B3. Communicating challenging learning expectations to each student

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

B4. Establishing and maintaining consistent standards of classroom behavior

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## B. CREATING AN ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

B5. Making the physical environment as safe and conducive to learning as possible

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

Use this space for any additional comments on the criteria in Domain B.

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## C. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING

C1. Making learning goals and instructional procedures clear to students

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

C2. Making content comprehensible to students

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## C. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

**C3. Encouraging students to extend their thinking**

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

**C4. Monitoring students' understanding of content through a variety of means, providing feedback to students to assist learning, and adjusting learning activities as the situation demands**

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Monitoring understanding:

Providing feedback:

Adjusting learning activities:

Summary Statement:

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

C. TEACHING FOR STUDENT LEARNING (cont'd)

C5. Using instructional time effectively

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

Use this space for any additional comments on the criteria in Domain C.

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## D. TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM

D1. Reflecting on the extent to which the learning goals were met

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

D2. Demonstrating a sense of efficacy

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

## D. TEACHER PROFESSIONALISM (con'td)

D3. **Building professional relationships with colleagues to share teaching insights and coordinate learning activities for students**

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

D4. Communicating with parents or guardians about student learning

1.0 ☐ 1.5 ☐ 2.0 ☐ 2.5 ☐ 3.0 ☐ 3.5 ☐

Summary Statement:

© 1993. Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved. EDUCATIONAL TESTING SERVICE, ETS, and ETS logo are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service. THE PRAXIS SERIES: PROFESSIONAL ASSESSMENTS FOR BEGINNING TEACHERS and its design logo are trademarks of Educational Testing Service.

P 2/9/93